



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 21, 2000

No. 32

## House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 21, 2000.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CONSTANCE A. MORELLA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent Resolution recognizing and honoring the members of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association (AHEPA) who are being awarded the AHEPA Medal for Military Service for service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106-31, as amended by Public Law 106-113, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) to the Russian Leadership Program Advisory Board.

### MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to

exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

### BEFORE NEW GUN LAW, ENFORCE ONES ON BOOKS

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, it reflects well on the human condition that tragedy often brings out the best in people: compassion, resolve, understanding. Sometimes, unfortunately, a tragedy can also release the darker human impulses: cynicism, dishonesty, and opportunism. It is a regret that many times individuals will take advantage of a tragedy to promote an ill-conceived agenda.

Last month, the Nation was stunned by the shocking death of 6-year-old Kayla Rolland in Mount Morris Township, Michigan. This young girl was killed in a classroom by a fellow student, a 6-year-old boy. This loss echoed beyond the family involved, her school, and their community. It touched all of us, evoking a sense of nationwide grief and dread.

Madam Speaker, sadly, it was not long before the heartbreaking death of this girl was transformed into a means of a lot of political points. That very day, the President announced that this tragedy should be an election issue. He went on to demand passage of various gun-control measures.

First, we should look at the facts of this matter and consider what difference this administration's proposals would have made. Chuck Green of the Denver Post did this for us when he asked these questions in a recent column:

Did the little boy have a concealed-carry permit?

Did the little boy purchase the weapon from an independent dealer after

failing a background check by a licensed dealer at a gun show?

Did the little boy use false identification when purchasing the weapon?

Did the little boy use an illegal automatic weapon in the assault?

Did the little boy have an older person, possibly a 9-year-old child, purchase this gun on his behalf?

The answer to this killing is not to be found in too few gun laws, but rather in how this boy was raised. He was living with his uncle and another man, sleeping on the couch in the living room.

It was a home reportedly with a constant flow of strangers seeking crack and trading guns. The .32 caliber pistol used to kill the girl was stolen.

Now, I expect that some of my colleagues would claim that child safety locks would have prevented the shooting in the classroom. Now, selling crack is illegal, as is trading for guns. Do they really think that these individuals would have obeyed a law requiring safety locks?

I would also remind my colleagues that Michigan already has a number of State laws targeting gun violence on the books. These are some of the laws: prohibit selling any firearm to a minor under 18; prohibit possession of a handgun by person under age 18; prohibit possession of any firearms, including BB guns on school property; prohibit possession of even a BB gun beyond the yard of a minor's home unless accompanied by a person over 18; prohibit intentionally pointing, even without malice, any firearm at another person; require that all handguns must be registered; require a license to purchase a handgun from a dealer or a private individual; void the handgun license if not used within 10 days of issuance; require theft of a gun to be reported to police within 5 days of discovery.

Gun violence is a scourge on our Nation, and we have a responsibility to tackle this plague, not with empty gestures, but with solid action. Instead of

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1125

passing new gun laws, we should enforce those already on the books.

Here in Washington, for example, there are 2,400 violent crimes committed with firearms in 1998. Only two criminals were prosecuted in Federal court for these gun crimes. This is not uncommon. A study by Syracuse University found that Federal prosecution of gun crimes has dropped, has dropped by 44 percent since 1993.

However, only a 2-hour drive from here, where I am speaking, vigorous Federal action has helped to reduce gun homicides in Richmond, Virginia, by one half. Project Exile is an effective, anti-violence program promising Federal prosecution and an additional 5 years in jail for felons caught with a gun. In Richmond, more prosecutions under Federal gun laws took place than in California, New Jersey, New York, and Washington, D.C. combined.

The President and his supporters want to create a false sense of security by enacting more laws with little or no real impact on the problem. A stronger commitment to enforcing the laws already on the books will do far more to protect our communities and our school rooms from gun violence.

#### GUN VIOLENCE UNDERCUTTING AMERICAN VALUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague discussing the issue of gun violence, but I could not disagree with his assessment more.

A livable community is one where people are safe, healthy, and economically secure. Gun violence undercuts each of those elements. We are not safe today in the epidemic of gun violence, whether it is in Mount Morris Township, Michigan; Littleton, Colorado; or Springfield, Oregon. Gun violence is a leading cause of death and injury, 12 per day for children alone. And our families are not economically secure. Gun injuries, injuries, cost almost \$20,000 per incident to treat, and the cost of a gun-related death is approximately one-third of a million dollars.

In the face of overwhelming evidence about gun violence, the gun apologists continue to argue that guns somehow make us safer, and simple common sense gun legislation is unnecessary. By their logic, we could get rid of metal detectors in airports. Yes, a few guns might get through, but almost certainly well-armed passengers would gun down the terrorists.

A little article in today's Post notes that for the second time in a week, a passenger was arrested on a plane for assaulting a pilot. Would we be better off if that passenger had been armed so that there would have been a gun battle instead of a fist fight?

The NRA argues that the people who want to reduce gun violence have blood

on their hands, that they want a certain level of violence. I was with the President of the United States as he visited the victims and the families in my State in Springfield, Oregon; and I know that such an assertion is as untrue as it is sick and twisted.

Tragically, it is consistent with the NRA's approach and that of their apologists. They oppose even the most simple common sense approaches. If they had their way, the Brady Bill would not have passed and 400,000 felons and mentally ill people would have had guns outright, instead of eliminating that opportunity for them. Does anyone think that that would have made us safer?

We do not have to be stalemated by this argument. There are simple common sense approaches. We can require safe storage of guns. Maybe it would not have made a difference for that little 6-year-old boy and the girl he shot in terms of that home, but maybe the gun would not have been stolen in the first place if it had been in a lockbox.

We can lead by example by making sure that smart gun technology is available for law enforcement officials. One in six law enforcement officials who are killed with a gun are killed with their own service revolver or that of one of their partners. If the Federal Government and State governments would announce that next year we will not purchase guns that are not personalized, that cannot be wrestled away, we could move that technology forward by leaps and bounds.

We can make guns safer to reduce accidental death and injury. Why in the name of all that is holy do we sell guns in this country that do not tell you whether or not there is a bullet in the chamber, when we have mandated child-proof bottles for aspirin and cigarette lighters? Why do we have more consumer protections for toy guns than real guns? Sadly, it is the apologists for the gun lobby who have had their way.

We can also keep guns out of the hands of violent felons; not just violent felons, but violent misdemeanants as well. A study at the University of California-Davis has demonstrated that those who are convicted of misdemeanor crimes are 7.5 times more likely to be charged with new crimes than those with no criminal records. The vast majority of people who own guns, as well as normal citizens who do not, support prohibitions like this.

Finally, we can take a step here in Congress today. We can end the gridlock. The Republican leadership should, must, let us move forward. The conferees on the juvenile violence bill have not met since August, hung up over these gun violence provisions. They ought to meet. They ought to meet today and allow us to vote on these simple, common sense provisions.

Finally, people at home today have an opportunity and responsibility themselves to reduce gun violence. Parents should not only demand that

Congress act, but they should make sure that if they have a gun in a home, that it is stored safely, and if a child of theirs is going to go next door to play at a neighbor's house, they ought to find out if there is a gun in that house and demand that it be stored safely before their child plays there.

There is no excuse for continuing to tolerate the highest rate of gun violence in the developed world in our country.

#### INS MANAGEMENT NEEDS TO DO ITS JOB

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Madam Speaker, I do not have to remind this House about the fine work of our Border Patrol agents. They put their lives at risk every day to slow the flow of illegal drugs into this country and to keep our borders safe from dangerous aliens. Their work in helping to arrest a suspected terrorist near Port Angeles, Washington, in December was exemplary. We all appreciate their efforts. Due to the current inept management of the INS, however, the job of these officers is made much, much more difficult.

□ 1245

Over the past two fiscal years, Congress has appropriated funds for the INS to hire 2,000 new Border Patrol agents. The agency has failed to hire anywhere near that number, and every new agent they have hired has been assigned to the southern border, even though our northern border also has problems.

In fact, until recently, the INS had been detailing agents from our already shorthanded northwestern border to shore up its Border Patrol officers in Arizona. At one point, nearly 10 percent of the field agents in Washington State were assigned to the southern border. The INS has indefinitely postponed the details, but refuses to call a permanent halt to transfers to the southern border.

This is not what Congress wanted. There were supposed to be more agents in Washington State, not less. I agree that there are serious problems on the southern border. That is why the INS was given so much money for the Border Patrol last year. The INS management needs to do its job and hire more agents instead of robbing from one shorthanded border to fill out another. There is no reason why northern border staffing should not be increased.

Last week, with my colleagues, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), I sent a letter to the INS Commissioner, Doris Meissner, demanding a permanent end to transfers of the northwestern Border

Patrol agents and urging higher staffing levels on the northern border.

Madam Speaker, how many more illegal drugs and weapons will flood across our northern border before the INS finally cleans up its act.

#### MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, should the Medicare program offer prescription drug coverage? What good is insurance if it covers the diagnosis, but not the cure. Of course, Medicare should cover prescription drugs.

Why can we not target coverage to just the lowest income seniors? I can think of several reasons why that is a bad idea. First, Medicare endures in this country because every American contributes to it and every American at the age of 65 will benefit from it. A third of all seniors, over 10 million seniors, lack drug coverage; millions more are barely insured; employers are dropping their retiree coverage and private health insurers are cutting back their prescription drug benefits.

This is not an isolated or a status problem that can be solved in a piecemeal fashion. It is broad based and it is getting worse. Whether or not Medicare should cover prescription drugs should not even be a real question. If one believes this Nation benefits from helping seniors live in good health and above poverty, then Medicare should cover prescription drugs. But it is expensive to cover prescription drugs.

Can our government afford it? We are the wealthiest Nation in the world. Our retirees are collectively responsible for our current prosperity. Their security and their well-being resonate across families, communities, and the Nation. We can afford to, and it is in our interests, to provide seniors health coverage that makes sense, and that means providing prescription drug coverage. But we cannot afford to waste tax dollars that otherwise would be used to bolster Medicare's long term solvency. We need to pay fair prices for prescription drugs.

So are the current prices fair? For the sake of argument let us define "fair" in this case as necessary to continue a brisk pace of research and development. Maybe prices are fair, maybe drug companies have no choice but to charge such high prices. But I doubt it. Knowing how much drug companies are investing in marketing, knowing what their profit margins are, knowing what their CEOs and top executives are paid, knowing that any reduction in prices can be largely offset by increases in sales volume, I doubt prescription drug prices need to be that high.

But even if drug makers could justify their revenue requirements, how could

they justify placing such a disproportionate burden on Americans? How can they justify charging Americans two and three and four times what they charge individuals in other industrialized nations. How and why are prescription drugs more expensive here? Because other countries will not tolerate these outrageous prices and because we in this Congress have tolerated them.

We do not negotiate prices; we do not demand that drug manufacturers reduce their prices to reflect the federally funded portion of research and development. We do not make use of the collective purchasing power of 38 million seniors to demand fairly-priced drugs. Instead, we nod our heads knowingly when drug manufacturers warn us that any action we take could stifle research and development. Drug prices can come down in the U.S. without stifling that research and development.

Take the case of medical devices. The Medicare program is the largest purchaser of medical devices in the U.S. Medicare pays discounted prices for medical devices and yet new devices are developed every day. The government funds 40 percent of the R&D in the United States. Sources other than drug companies fund another 10 percent of drug research and development. Drug companies receive huge tax breaks, drug makers pay an effective rate 10 percentage points lower than the average for all major industries. Drug profits are 5 percent higher than any other industry.

In 1998, the CEO of Bristol-Meyers-Squibb was paid \$146 million in salary and benefits. Obviously, a fast way to make money is to charge inflated prices for prescription drugs. It works beautifully for the drug companies, but it does not make it right.

So what do we do about high drug prices? The drug industry says the best way is to make prescription drugs affordable for seniors by enrolling all 38 million in private health insurance plans. That clearly has not worked as we have seen the price of health insurance go up and up and up.

We have other options. I have introduced legislation that would give drug manufacturers a choice. They could either disclose their true costs and work with us to bring the prices down, or they could license their patents to generic drug companies and let the free market, using good old-fashioned competition, bring prices to a more reasonable level.

The gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) has introduced legislation that would permit seniors to purchase drugs at discounted prices. The gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BERRY) have introduced legislation that would permit us to import drugs when they are priced less expensively in other countries.

So I ask again, should Medicare provide prescription drug coverage for seniors? The answer is yes. Will it be ex-

pensive? The answer is yes. Is there some way we can make it less expensive? The answer is a resounding yes.

Now, will this Congress add a drug benefit to Medicare this year? I do not know the answer to that. We may not get a chance to vote, or the majority of the Republican leadership may go with yet another stopgap measure rather than taking a logical step in updating the Medicare benefits package.

#### LEGISLATION TO ALLOW FDA AUTHORITY TO REGULATE TOBACCO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, today the Supreme Court recognized that tobacco use is perhaps the most single significant threat to public health in the United States. Unfortunately, the Court also ruled that Congress had not given the Food and Drug Administration explicit authority to regulate tobacco.

We can change that today.

The Republican leadership blocked legislation in the past to give FDA this authority. This afternoon, I will reintroduce a bill that gives FDA explicit authority to regulate tobacco.

The Republican leadership has sole power to bring this bill to the floor this week or next week or next month. But the day has passed to ignore tobacco's deadly toll and the thousands of children who start smoking every day. We cannot look to FDA. We cannot look to the courts. We have the responsibility, and we must act.

Two years ago, I reached a comprehensive agreement with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, to reduce smoking by children. The Republican leadership must let the House consider tobacco legislation. It is long overdue.

We had hoped the Supreme Court would have allowed the FDA to regulate tobacco on its own. Their decision today by 5 to 4 has sent the issue back to the Congress. It is now our responsibility. We can ignore that responsibility no longer.

With the bill that I will introduce today, it will be very clear that FDA will be able to regulate tobacco as they have chosen to do to stop them from targeting our kids. I call on the Republican leadership to work on a bipartisan basis to give the FDA this authority. We must stop tobacco companies from going after our children at the ages of 12, 13, and 14 to get them to start smoking a product that they know will hook many of them and keep them smoking into adulthood.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 2 p.m.

## PRAYER

The Reverend Douglas Tanner, Faith and Politics Institute, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we gather on this rainy afternoon in Washington aware that it is springtime. There may be a chill in the air, but there are blossoms on the cherry trees. Some of us have begun to work in our gardens, digging, planting, pruning. We are familiar with the springtime tasks, and at least when we have time, we welcome them as paths to new vitality and beauty and fruitfulness.

Grant us, we pray, a similar awareness of the tasks that lead to healthy politics and sound policy. Help us to know where to dig, what to plant, when to prune. And lead us to take up those tasks together. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PITTS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

# HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 22, 2000

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on tomorrow, Wednesday, March 22, 2000.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

## SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, every American contributes to Social Security, hoping one day that that investment will help him or her to retire comfortably. We expect and hope that those dollars will one day come back to us with interest.

For generations, this program has worked fairly well, but we now have a younger generation that is not so confident about the Social Security system. Most young people in their 20s with whom I speak do not count on getting a dime from Social Security when they retire, and they know how much better their own investments perform compared to the low rates of return earned by the Social Security Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker, the Social Security system is a good program, millions of Americans depend on it; but it is time that we allowed Americans to invest a small portion of their FICA taxes into an authorized group of funds, like a 401(k) or a pension plan, an individual retirement account, to get the benefit of compound interest. It is time we made some changes, reform that will save and strengthen Social Security in the long run.

# CORRUPTION IN THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, 19 years ago, I defended myself and was found innocent of RICO violations. Forensic tests proved that the Justice Department used a fraudulent confession against me. What is even worse, at my trial the FBI admitted they had evidence that the agent-in-charge of the Youngstown FBI office, Mr. Stan Peterson, was on the payroll of the Mob, and when he retired, was appointed the chief of police of Youngstown at the direction of the Mob.

Now, if that is not enough to shred the Constitution. The FBI further testified they never investigated Stan Peterson. Enough is enough. I am announcing formally today that I am once again a target of the Justice Department.

Listen, I plan to fight like a junkyard dog, and if I die in that courtroom, bring it on; but I want to thank every Member for their encouragement that they have given me and for their good concerns.

In America, the person governs. We should not fear the IRS. We took care of that.

I will be submitting legislation this week that will provide for outside investigations into wrongdoing in the Justice Department. Right now, the Justice Department investigates the Justice Department.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the corruption in the Justice Department.

## DEADLY CARGO

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, this week we will have an opportunity to once again protect our Nation, our citizens, and our environment by voting no on S. 1287, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act.

If passed, Mr. Speaker, S. 1287 will launch the largest nuclear waste shipping program in human history.

A no vote will send a clear message that we do not support transporting the world's deadliest material, nuclear waste, through our Nation's cities, near our children's schools, and through our rural communities.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Transportation reported that in a 10-year period there were almost 100,000 transportation accidents releasing hazardous materials; 100,000.

Just imagine the consequences of a transport accident involving nuclear fuel containing massive amounts of radioactivity occurring as it travels through the most congested cities of 43 States.

Mr. Speaker, let us not put millions of our Americans or our environment at risk. Vote no on S. 1287.

I yield back S. 1287, a plan to transport nuclear waste that only serves to jeopardize the health and the welfare of every American.

# COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEKAS) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 20, 2000.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on March 20, 2000 at 3:00 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits a proposed Agreement with Bangladesh on the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

MARTHA C. MORRISON,  
Deputy Clerk of the House.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF BANGLADESH CONCERNING PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106-213)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together

with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153 (b), (d)) (the Act), the text of a proposed Agreement Between the United States of America and the People's Republic of Bangladesh to extend the Agreement for Cooperation Between the United States of America and the People's Republic of Bangladesh Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy signed at Dhaka, September 17, 1981 (the Agreement for Cooperation).

The proposed Agreement to extend the Agreement for Cooperation (the "Extension Agreement") was originally approved and its execution authorized by President Bush based on his written determination that the performance of the Agreement for Cooperation for an additional period of 20 years would promote, and would not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. A copy of President Bush's written approval, authorization, and determination is enclosed. Also enclosed is a copy of the unclassified Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement (NPAS) prepared at that time by the Director, United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The proposed Extension Agreement was effected by an exchange of diplomatic notes at Dhaka on January 5, 1993, and February 6, 1993. The terms of the Extension Agreement condition its entry into force on each State notifying the other of the completion of its respective legal requirements for entry into force. However, before the proposed Extension Agreement could be submitted to the Congress in 1993 for review pursuant to section 123 of the Act, the Government of Bangladesh asked to consult with the United States regarding a possible modification of the term of extension. These discussions proved to be very protracted, but both Governments have now agreed that their original intention to extend the Agreement for Cooperation for an additional period of 20 years from the date of the original Agreement's expiration (i.e., to extend its until June 24, 2012) should stand, and that the Extension Agreement should be brought into force as soon as each Party has notified the other in writing that it has completed its legal requirements for doing so.

Section 123 of the Act, as amended by Title XII of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-277) now also provides that each Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement prepared pursuant to the Act shall be accompanied by a classified annex prepared by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information. The

Secretary of State is submitting to the Congress under separate cover such a classified annex. It contains, *inter alia*, the Secretary of State's reaffirmation of the conclusions reached in the original unclassified Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement (a) that continued implementation of the Agreement for Cooperation is consistent with all requirements of the Act, and (b) that the safeguards and other control mechanisms and the peaceful-use assurances contained in the Agreement for Cooperation are adequate to ensure that any assistance furnished under it will not be used to further any military or nuclear explosive purpose.

I am pleased to reconfirm President Bush's approval of the Extension Agreement and authorization of its execution and implementation. Bangladesh is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and is fully in compliance with its nuclear nonproliferation commitments under that Treaty. In my judgment, continued performance of the Agreement for Cooperation between the United States of America and the People's Republic of Bangladesh Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy will promote, and not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Apart from the proposed extension, the Agreement for Cooperation will remain in all other respects the same as that which was favorably reviewed by the Congress in 1982. The Department of State, the Department of Energy, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission have reconfirmed their favorable views regarding the original NPAS as well as the conclusions contained herein.

This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Act. My Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House International Relations Committee as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the period of 30 days of continuous session provided for in section 123 b., the period of 60 days of continuous session provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 20, 2000.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to in under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken after debate is concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 7 p.m. today.

RECOGNIZING IMPORTANCE OF  
FAMILIES AND CHILDREN IN  
UNITED STATES AND EXPRESS-  
ING SUPPORT FOR GOALS AND  
IDEAS OF NATIONAL FAMILY  
DAY

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 288) recognizing the importance of families and children in the United States and expressing support for the goals and ideas of National Family Day.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 288

Whereas national evidence indicates that America's kids are faced with oppressive issues such as violence, drugs, abuse, and even family stress, causing the future of the children of the United States, and therefore the future of the Nation, to be at risk;

Whereas families in the United States, regardless of their economic status, ethnic or cultural heritage, or geographic location, are experiencing the pressures caused by contemporary society while trying to raise and nurture emotionally healthy and physically safe children;

Whereas Americans realize the challenges of spending quality family time together amidst today's busy lifestyles and balancing work schedules and kids' activities to regularly share a family meal;

Whereas it is imperative that the people of the United States act willfully and purposely to secure a positive future for the Nation by devoting time to family bonding, sharing traditions, and communicating values to children in an effort to sustain the importance of family;

Whereas KidsPeace, one of the Nation's oldest, most comprehensive not-for-profit organizations dedicated to helping children attain the confidence and courage needed to face and overcome crises, has established National FamilyDay to focus unified attention on nurturing family relationships and improving family communications thereby helping to build strong families which give kids peace;

Whereas National FamilyDay will be celebrated annually on a Sunday in March; and

Whereas National FamilyDay will provide opportunities for families to reclaim the family mealtime which fosters trust and builds better communication, and will encourage parents, grandparents, and caregivers to recognize the importance of being involved in the physical and emotional lives of their children: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—*

(1) recognizes the importance of children and families to the future of the United States;

(2) expresses support for the goals and ideas of National FamilyDay as established by KidsPeace;

(3) encourages the people of the United States to participate in local and national activities honoring National FamilyDay; and

(4) believes that families who communicate and spend time together create stronger families which give kids peace.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEKAS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 288, to recognize the importance of families and children in the United States and to express support for the goals and ideas of National Family Day.

Let us not underestimate the importance of families. Today's families provide the foundation for America's future. The family is the most fundamental of society's institutions, for it is within the family setting that character, morality, responsibility, and wisdom are nurtured best in children.

Families that have committed and dedicated parents raise children who prefer commitment rather than self-indulgence, become law-abiding rather than law-avoiding, and become productive members of society.

On the other hand, when the family structure is not strong, the results for individuals and society in general are not nearly as bright.

Research on the effects of the out-of-wedlock birth and divorce show that children in broken families drop out of school more frequently, become sexually active at younger ages, have higher rates of crime and drug abuse, and earn lower incomes as adults. And I want to point out that I have an exception up there, a young man who is now at West Point, who does not fit into that category.

Statistics regarding the collapse of the American family are disheartening. According to the National Center for Health Statistics, 32.8 percent of all children born in 1997 were born out of wedlock. These percentages were not unique with regard to race. The number of children born out of wedlock was disturbingly high among whites, blacks, and Hispanics.

A total of 20 million children now live with single parents in the United States. Of these children, 12.6 million live in the poorest families.

The ramifications of these high divorce rates are discouraging. More and more Americans are members of the second, third, and even forth generation of broken families in which fathers and mothers are alienated from one another, leaving their children to bear the consequences.

The American Journal of Sociology and the Journal of Marriage and the Family report that divorce weakens a child's relationship with his or her parents, creates emotional problems that reinforces destructive ways of handling conflicts, and diminishes social competence.

Apart from the physical dilapidation of families, research has also demonstrated the devastating consequences of dysfunctional families.

The amount of conversation and the level of interaction between parents and children have an enormous impact on children's development. The reduction of interaction between parents and their children should, therefore, be a grave cause for concern to all of us.

According to the University of Maryland, by 1990 parents on average were

available to their children 10 hours less per week than they were in 1980 and 40 percent less than in 1965.

H. Con. Res. 288 recognizes and supports National Family Day to help focus attention on nurturing family relationships and improving family communication. H. Con. Res. 288 recognizes the importance of children and families to the future of the United States, encourages citizens to participate in local and national activities honoring National Family Day, and encourages families to communicate and spend more time together to create stronger families.

National Family Day is a relatively new annual event held every year in March to honor and celebrate the importance of the American family. National Family Day was established by Kids Peace, a nonprofit organization that is dedicated to helping children obtain the confidence and courage needed to face and overcome crises. Kids Peace helps over 2,000 children in crisis each day at 25 centers across the Nation.

Once again, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and Kids Peace for their efforts to improve America's families. I urge my colleagues and people across the country to join with them in supporting efforts to help our families.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce that I serve on, for managing the time. I would also like to thank my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), who has joined together with me to introduce this resolution and cosponsor it and talk about it on the floor; and I look forward to his comments, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 288, which recognizes the importance, the vital importance, of children and families in the United States and expresses the support of some of the following goals of a National Family Day.

One of the things that this concurrent resolution expresses, and I think this is important for our colleagues to hear, it is the second "whereas" clause. "Whereas national evidence indicates that America's kids are faced with oppressive issues such as violence, drugs, abuse, and even family stress, causing the future of the children of the United States, and therefore the future of the Nation, to be at risk."

Now, we had a report several years ago, about 16 years ago, in 1984, which was a report on the status of American education which firmly and boldly stated that, if education was at risk, America was at risk.

Our families are the foundation of everything in this country.

□ 1415

And so if there is something directed or targeted at the stability, the care, the community, the love, the sustainability of our families, it is targeted at the health, the very fiber and the very soul of our country. So this resolution, I think, simply tries to state that in all the busy things that we do in Congress, at work, in our communities, that nothing is more important in our homes than time spent with our children.

Another whereas clause simply states, on page 2, whereas it is imperative that the people of the United States act willfully and purposely to secure a positive future for the Nation by devoting time to family bonding, sharing traditions, and communicating values to children in an effort to sustain the importance of family.

Mr. Speaker, this is what this resolution is all about. It is simple, straightforward, and bipartisan in its appeal on behalf of our families and our children to refocus attention on the family and on spending time with our children in order to strengthen families and create healthy communication between our children and our parents. National Family Day is a new annual event held on a Sunday in March to honor and celebrate the American family.

Mr. Speaker, our children are our most precious gift. We cannot afford to let even one slip through the cracks. KidsPeace and other organizations throughout the United States are doing good work in reaching out to those children who are most at risk in society and helping them develop the courage and the skills to overcome crises. But no matter how hard they try, these organizations cannot take the place of loving parents, stable homes, and a healthy environment in which kids can feel safe, loved and positive about their lives and their futures.

I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, as Robert Kennedy once said, and I quote, when one of us prospers, all of us prosper, and when one of us fails, so do we all.

We cannot afford to have one of our children fail in this great Nation. Therefore, let us emphasize the importance of one of the most important institutions that can help save our children, and that is the institution of family. Let us pass this bipartisan day. Let us put emphasis on a simple yet straightforward, yet vitally important concept of family, and let us focus on this as a solution to many problems in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the cosponsor on our side of the legislation, a very important member of the Pennsylvania delegation.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, we are here today, and I rise in strong support

of House Concurrent Resolution 288 authored, as we have heard, by myself and my friend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER). H. Con. Res. 288 supports National Family Day as we have heard which is sponsored by KidsPeace. KidsPeace is a national, nonprofit organization based in the Lehigh Valley in Pennsylvania. They have dozens of facilities across the country, treating over 2,000 children facing crisis.

KidsPeace also has various prevention programs to help children before a crisis arises. It cares for some of our most troubled children and helps all of the children they deal with to develop the confidence and the skills to avoid and to overcome crisis. They help children anticipate and overcome crises from disasters and personal traumas, to family issues and neglect, to severe depression, eating disorders, and the general stresses that any children experience in our modern society.

I am very proud to have such a worthwhile organization based in my community in the 15th District of Pennsylvania. What KidsPeace has done is they have developed a great idea with the National Tabletop and Giftware Association, the folks who make the plates, the silverware, and the cooking utensils we use to prepare our meals.

Their idea is this National Family Day, a day to remind us of the need to reclaim the family mealtime for the family. This year is its first year. National Family Day is this coming Sunday, March 26. It will always be held on a Sunday in March.

KidsPeace is undertaking a variety of activities to support this National Family Day. Perhaps most interesting of these is this brochure that I am holding in my hand. Plate and silverware companies throughout our Nation are distributing millions of these brochures at their stores. As the brochure says, "The family evening meal has been the source of building healthy communication and family bonds for centuries. Yet it is becoming a lost art in modern America."

The brochure goes on to give eight simple steps on how a family can reclaim their mealtime to foster open communication and healthy relationships. KidsPeace and its President, C.T. O'Donnell, are to be commended for developing this brochure. I also want to commend the National Tabletop and Giftware Association and its president, William Simpson of Pfaltzgraff in York, Pennsylvania. I believe that is the chairman's hometown, for distributing this brochure. I want to thank the majority leader, the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and certainly the gentleman from Indiana for all of their work and help on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House's indulgence for one last note before I conclude. When I announced these efforts and my introduction of a House resolution at a news conference in my dis-

trict, we were joined by a family from the Lehigh Valley. Eric and Toni Hummel with their son Michael who is 9 years old and their daughter Lauren who is 1 talked about the need for a reminder to help make family mealtimes a priority in all of our family lives.

I took their words to heart because my wife and I are expecting our first child in June. We both know that we have very busy lives and we will have to be constantly on guard that we are not letting our child's time slip away from us. I want to thank my colleagues. I want to thank them for all their help in support of this resolution which will serve as the reminder that the Hummel family pointed out to all of us.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding me this time and thank him for his involvement with this legislation as I do the gentleman from Pennsylvania, apparently everybody from Pennsylvania is involved, and commend them for this resolution.

I would, however, say this, that I would hope that as we count down the number of legislative days remaining in this session that we keep the purpose and the intent of this resolution in mind and that is about strengthening families and giving families the tools by which they can strengthen the relationship among the members of that family, especially with their children, recognizing the complexities and the pressures of contemporary American society. But I would hope also that the Congress would take this resolution to heart and would understand that there is a family agenda that yet needs to be met within this Congress. It deals with the issues of education, it deals with the issue of the safety of our children, it deals with the issue of the health care available to our families, housing available to our families and the kind of child care that is now needed by families as they find the pressures of the workplace encroaching more and more on the time that they used to have for their families and to take care of the mentoring of their children.

And to fix our crumbling schools. We see there is some \$112 to \$115 billion backlog in school facilities, recognizing the need to do this so children can go to a decent facility where they can engage in the learning experience and acquire the tools that will benefit them as they take their place in our society. I am worried that this resolution becomes a substitute for addressing that agenda, because that would not be fair to America's families.

Clearly America's families, those who toil at the minimum wage, need an increase in the minimum wage. We know that those who toil at the min-

imum wage continue to toil and at the end of the year if they work all year long, they are below the poverty rate in this country. We now see where the biggest growth in homeless, certainly in my State in California but in many other areas of the Nation, is working families with children.

They simply have been priced out of the market. It does not mean they are not working. It does not mean they are not caring for their children. It does not mean they do not love their children. They simply now are unable to find housing for their children. That is the biggest new growth rate in homeless in the State of California which is having an economic resurgence unparalleled anywhere else in the country.

At a time when we are creating over 100 millionaires a week, we find out that the very same people who are working for many of those millionaires in their factories are unable to live near their work or to find a house at all for them and for their children. In many instances those workers are temporary workers, they work essentially what we would call full time but they are characterized as temporary workers, which means they do not get the benefits. So they do not have health care for them or their children.

In many instances the companies fail to provide it or are unable to provide it. And so clearly there are these kinds of efforts that we can make on behalf of America's families and on behalf of America's children. Because in many instances there is no other place for these families to go to get help while they work and they struggle and they work full time. They do not have the means to provide health insurance. They do not have the means to provide housing. They are going to have to turn for assistance to the other, the great American family, if you will, that sees that plight and understands that struggle.

So hopefully this resolution will not only recognize the needs of families and our commitments to them, it will also provide them some additional empathy by Members of Congress of the plight of many millions of American families who are working very hard and struggling and still not able to make ends meet that we have an obligation to see what we can do to make sure that they can do that so they can provide a healthy environment and a sustainable environment for their children.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The author of the resolution made reference to the brochure, "Reclaim the Family Mealtime". It says on the front cover, "Are you losing contact with the people you love? Is your family time being squeezed out by work pressures, kids' activities, and a hectic, fast-paced schedule?" Then inside it says, "If so, the solution may be as close as this evening's meal."

I am reminded even though we were a family of eight, six children and dirt



poor, we did not realize we were poor because of the closeness of that family relationship. Through my first eight grades in school, as a matter of fact, we sat down together at meals three times a day, because we went home for lunch rather than stay in school. And then when we went on to high school, we still had meals together two times a day. What an important time that was.

Today, we oftentimes hear people say, well, mother and father both have to work. That is not necessarily so. It depends on the lifestyle you want. Yes, I got my first suit of long pants given to me by neighbors. Only one worked away from home.

So oftentimes we find excuses as to why we do as little as we do to keep families together, but I do not think there are any statistics that would prove otherwise than that a family unit is one of the three or four most important things we have going for us in a free society and without it, that society will fall from within.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 288, to recognize the importance of families and children in the United States, and to express support for the goals and ideas of National Family Day.

You know, its no secret that the family is the most fundamental of society's institutions, for it is within the family setting that character, morality, responsibility, ability, and wisdom are nurtured best in children.

Unfortunately, today, the family institution is being steadily dismantled, even held in disdain by many leaders in the political, academic and media elite.

And the erosion has serious consequences:

In 1950, for every 100 children born, 12 entered a broken family. Today, for every 100 children born, 60 will enter a broken family. Each year, about one million children experience the divorce of their parents. 1.25 million are born out of wedlock, and another 1.4 million are aborted. Child abuse is growing steadily and alarmingly sexual abuse amongst children is growing fastest of all.

In short, Americans are literally turning against their children. But adults suffer as well from the breakdown of the family institution. Studies clearly show that those who divorce suffer shorter life expectancies, poorer physical and psychological health and lowered standards of living.

In addition, research continues on the correlation between a family founded on a lifelong marriage and low incidences of crime, addiction, abuse, illness, and underachievement.

Our country must focus national attention on problems whose roots lie in the breakdown of the family institution and marriage, as well as public policies that contribute to those problems.

On the national level, over the last few years, Congress has begun to evaluate how the federal government's policies have been hostile to marriage and the family.

Last month, the House overwhelmingly passed the Marriage Penalty Tax Relief Act, which will stop the government's practice of excessively taxing couples just because they are married. This will keep the IRS off the

alter and provide more money for families that may mean a new washing machine, extra tuition money for a child, a three bedroom home or fixing the family car—this is real relief for working families.

In 1997, we passed the \$500-per-child tax credit, the most important policy advance for the family. And we enacted adoption and foster care reforms so that children are given permanent homes quickly and not left revolving in the child welfare system year after year.

And in 1996, we reformed welfare ending the cycle of dependency for many. We ended the practice of having the government filling the roles of family, church and voluntary associations.

This year, we will take up important legislation establishing education savings accounts permitting parents to put money aside for a child's education.

But, beyond the beltway, beyond this Capitol, is where most of the changes are occurring—as is often the case.

This is where the real change is taking place—and rightly so.

Abstinence education to address the rising rates of out-of-wedlock births, counseling to address the rising rates of divorce and after-school programs to get kids off the street are happening throughout America.

KidsPeace, a 117-year-old non-profit organization that directly helps over 2,000 children in crisis every day at 25 centers across the nation, and millions more through prevention and public education efforts, recognizes all of these facts and has created National Family Day.

National Family Day is a relatively new, annual event held every March to honor and celebrate the importance of the American family.

This year, it will focus attention on the family meal as a time to build healthy communication and lasting bonds with children.

The amount of conversation and the level of interaction between parents and children has an enormous impact on a child's development. Even in intact families, however, children suffer from a lack of intimate time with their parents. One of the sad consequences of the breakdown of society today is that, to pay the bills or fulfill their higher expectations for material comforts, more mothers work outside of the home. This fact coupled with the numbers of single-parent families and the rising rate of divorce, means there has been a tragic reduction in "family time."

Adequate time with parents is critical for the development of every child, especially for self-esteem and confidence. The reduction of time between parents and children is cause for grave concern. It attenuates the most important relationship to a child and correspondingly derives him of the strength he derives from his parents.

As Harvard University child psychiatrist Robert Cole puts it, "The frenzied need of children to have possessions isn't only a function of the ads they see on TV. It's a function of their hunger for what they aren't getting—their parents' time."

By 1990, parents were, on average, available 10 hours less per week to their children than they were in 1980 and 40 percent less than they were in 1965.

In a 1990 Los Angeles Times poll found that 57 percent of all fathers and 55 percent of all mothers felt guilty about spending too little time with their children. The poll also found

that 73 percent of all married couples would have one parent stay home full-time with the children if money were not the issue.

I congratulate KidsPeace for their efforts to improve the family structure and call on my colleagues and everyone in our country to join with them in supporting efforts which will create stronger families.

□ 1430

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEKAS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 288.

The question was taken.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 288.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### KERN COUNTY CALIFORNIA LAND EXCHANGE ACT OF 2000

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1680) to provide for the conveyance of Forest Service property in Kern County, California, in exchange for county lands suitable for inclusion in Sequoia National Forest, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1680

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Kern County California Land Exchange Act of 2000".*

#### SEC. 2. LAND EXCHANGE, CAMP OWEN AND RELATED PARCELS, KERN COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

*(a) EXCHANGE REQUIRED.—In exchange for the non-Federal lands and the additional consideration described in subsection (b), the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey to Kern County, California, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to four parcels of land under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service in Kern County, as follows:*

*(1) Approximately 70 acres known as Camp Owen.*

*(2) Approximately 4 acres known as Wofford Heights Park.*

*(3) Approximately 4 acres known as the French Gulch maintenance yard.*

*(4) Approximately 14 acres known as the Kernville Fish Hatchery.*



(b) *CONSIDERATION.*—

(1) *CONVEYANCE OF NON-FEDERAL LANDS.*—As consideration for the conveyance of the Federal lands referred to in subsection (a), Kern County shall convey to the Secretary a parcel of land consisting of approximately 52 acres of Greenhorn Mountain Park in Kern County, California, which is owned by Kern County within Sequoia National Forest.

(2) *REPLACEMENT FACILITY.*—As additional consideration for the conveyance of the storage facility located at the maintenance yard referred to in subsection (a)(3), Kern County shall provide a replacement storage facility of comparable size and condition, as acceptable to the Secretary, at the Greenhorn Ranger District Lake Isabella Maintenance Yard property.

(3) *CASH EQUALIZATION PAYMENT.*—As additional consideration for the conveyance of the Federal lands referred to in subsection (a), Kern County shall tender a cash equalization payment specified by the Secretary, but not to exceed \$100,000. Subject to such limitation, the cash equalization payment shall be based upon an appraisal performed at the option of the Forest Service pursuant to section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)).

(c) *CONDITIONS ON ACCEPTANCE.*—Title to the non-Federal lands to be conveyed under this section must be acceptable to the Secretary, and the conveyance shall be subject to valid existing rights of record. The non-Federal lands shall conform with the title approval standards applicable to Federal land acquisitions.

(d) *TIME FOR CONVEYANCE.*—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary shall complete the conveyance of the Federal lands under subsection (a) within three months after Kern County tenders to the Secretary the consideration required by subsection (b).

(e) *STATUS OF ACQUIRED LANDS.*—Upon approval and acceptance of title by the Secretary, the non-Federal lands conveyed to the United States under this section shall become part of Sequoia National Forest, and the boundaries of the national forest shall be adjusted to include the acquired lands. The Secretary shall manage the acquired lands for recreational purposes in accordance with the laws and regulations pertaining to the National Forest System. For purposes of section 7 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460l-9), the boundaries of the national forest, as adjusted pursuant to this section, shall be considered to be the boundaries of the national forest as of January 1, 1965.

(f) *RELATIONSHIP TO ENVIRONMENTAL LIABILITY.*—In connection with the conveyances under this section, the Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions related to environmental liability as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(g) *LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.*—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be exchanged under this section shall be determined by a survey or surveys satisfactory to the Secretary. The costs of any such survey, as well as other administrative costs incurred to execute the land exchange (other than costs incurred by Kern County to comply with subsection (h)), shall be divided equally between the Secretary and Kern County.

(h) *TREATMENT OF EXISTING UTILITY LINES AT CAMP OWEN.*—Upon receipt of the Federal lands described in subsection (a)(1), Kern County shall grant an easement, and record the easement in the appropriate office, for permitted or licensed uses of those lands that are unrecorded as of the date of the conveyance.

(i) *APPLICABLE LAW.*—Except as otherwise provided in this section, any exchange of National Forest System land under this section shall be subject to the laws (including regulations) applicable to the conveyance and acquisition of land for the National Forest System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1680 introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), provides for a land exchange between the Stanislaus Forest and Kern County, California. It will transfer approximately 70 acres of national forest land that has been used by the county for more than 50 years as a juvenile detention facility known as Camp Owen to county ownership.

In exchange, the county will transfer the undeveloped portion of its Greenhorn Mountain Park, approximately 52 acres, to the Forest Service which manages the adjacent national forest lands. Several other small parcels are also included in exchange, and the county will provide a cash equalization payment to the Forest Service to make up the difference in land values.

The Forest Service and the county have worked hard to resolve their differences over details of this bill. I congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) for his work in achieving this agreement, which is reflected in the amendment that was reported by the Committee on Resources.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill which will ensure that the lands transferred to the county will continue to be used as a juvenile detention facility and school. Valid existing rights will be protected and land ownership will be consolidated, which should improve management efficiencies for both the Forest Service and Kern County. Therefore, I urge support of this bill as amended, and I congratulate my colleague for his work to bring about this agreement on the details of this exchange.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1680. This legislation provides for a land exchange between Kern County, California, and the U.S. Forest Service. The county would receive four parcels totaling about 92 acres of Federal property in exchange for one parcel of about 52 acres of county-owned property.

The county is currently operating a juvenile justice facility on the Federal lands under permit. The county-owned lands, which are wooded, are deemed suitable for inclusion in the Sequoia National Forest. So a land swap in this case makes good sense.

The substitute adopted by the committee has greatly improved this legis-

lation. As amended, the bill now provides for an equal-value exchange and public process in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act. Formal appraisals are normally required in Federal land exchanges, but in this case the Forest Service is given the option of relying on a preliminary appraisal and may receive a cash equalization payment of up to \$100,000.

While we do not intend that this serve as a model for equalization in other exchanges, the difference in value is estimated to be in the range of \$50,000 and the extra time and expense of a formal appraisal may not be necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the sponsor, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), and the majority for their willingness to make changes in this legislation to accommodate both our concerns and those of the Forest Service. I am pleased to support H.R. 1680 and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the author of this legislation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a long, twisted road that really should have been a relatively short driveway in achieving today's presentation on the floor of the House. As was indicated, this was an attempt to resolve land use conflicts that developed over half a century. On the Valley floor near the Kern River, which is pretty much barren and rock strewn land, although above 4,000 feet in elevation, about half a century ago the county began developing a youth detention camp along the model with which most of us would be familiar. If one takes youths who really are not bad, but who have an over-abundance of energy, and direct it toward positive and useful activity in a rather hardy environment, then a number of them become very useful and model citizens. This has been successful for more than half a century.

As one might expect, the uses of the camp, which were fairly rustic initially, have developed more into activities that would be meaningful to youth today: the building of a large garage facility in which they can rehabilitate cars; the development of a fish hatchery in which they can involve themselves in useful experiences that actually become quite useful when they are out looking for a job, all of this developed on land that was Forest Service land.

Now, one would never recognize it as Forest Service land, but it was Forest Service land. At the same time, the County of Kern, one of the larger geographic counties in the United States, had, in a mountainous area about 7,000 feet high, county property covered with large conifers that had never been developed, which was immediately adjacent to Sequoia National Forest. It

looked like Forest Service land. It was not used like a county parcel would ordinarily be used because of its remote location and the profile of the land itself.

So we thought several years ago that it would be a very appropriate land swap. The idea that Kern County and the citizens of Kern County, taxpayers, would not want to ask the Federal Government to give us the land, but rather it was quite appropriate to trade that mountainous fir-covered land for the developed land, the county land for the Federal land. We then embarked on a process of trying to get the Forest Service to say yes.

What happened over a number of years was that the Forest Service would not say yes. The Forest Service wanted us to give up the lion's share of the land and they would give us less. Kern County agreed.

The Forest Service did not want any camp sites in that county land up in the mountains, so we shaped it to solve the Forest Service problems. The Forest Service said, even though there is a maintenance yard that has been used as the county and we are willing to give it to them, we want them to duplicate the facilities so that we can have our own. The county agreed.

The Forest Service then said, if there were any environmental problems on this conifer-covered land, we certainly would not want to go through an environmental impact study like anybody else would, so we would like protection. We want to be indemnified from any case that might be brought against us. Kern County agreed.

We finally came to the last piece of the puzzle and that was, notwithstanding all of these concessions, we do not know for sure whether the land in an accessible usable area is of the same value as land that is in an inaccessible area that is not going to be used. So Kern County, to try to end this process of the Forest Service never willing to say yes, said we will place hard-earned county taxpayer money on the table as well.

How much? We do not know for sure. Maybe it was 40 thousand dollars. Maybe it was 50 thousand. The Forest Service could not come up with a firm number. So what Kern County has said was we will double it. We will say not more than \$100,000, assuming it is going to be fifty cents or less on the dollar, to get this agreement culminated so that we can continue to develop this youth camp.

I just want to say that four bills have passed Congress this year in which there have been absolute gifts of Federal land. We have an exchange with money in this bill, and yet it has been more than one Congress before we could reach this position. I just want to thank all of the folks who endured with us this inability of the Forest Service to say yes. We still have the provision in which they may say no, but at least, we are to the floor. At least, it has been a public process. At

least, there has been public input. At least, there is a public record before we go forward in dealing with taking land that belongs to the public and doing something with it.

So notwithstanding the tale that I just told, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that we are at the point we are today and am very concerned about processes that have occurred in the past and may occur in the future when this administration, under ancient law passed in 1906, called the Antiquities Act, will be able to deal with public lands without the public hearings, without the public process, and without the public's representatives voting on legislation that is the Antiquities Act; and, believe it or not, there is a proposal that will deal directly with the same national forest this bill does, the Sequoia National Forest, with no requirement to follow the public process that this modest little bill deals with, 52 acres. The proposal is in the vicinity of 400,000 acres.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, if this process is good enough for me, it ought to be good enough for the President when he makes decisions about the public lands.

So once again, I want to applaud those individuals who have brought the land swap to this position today, and I would urge all of us to be very, very cautious about removing public lands from public use without a public process.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1680, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SENSE OF HOUSE THAT NATIONAL PARK SERVICE SHOULD USE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SUPPORT SERVICES

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 182) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the National Park Service should take full advantage of support services offered by the Department of Defense.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 182

Whereas the National Park Service was established to promote and regulate units of superlative natural, historic, and recreation areas known as national parks, monuments, and other reservations;

Whereas the purpose of the National Park Service is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife

therein and to provide for the public enjoyment of the same;

Whereas, in order to accomplish and provide for this purpose, units of the National Park System contain structures, roads, and other related infrastructure;

Whereas the National Park Service has repeatedly reported a backlog of projects necessary to maintain these structures, roads, and infrastructure and has asserted that approximately \$6,000,000,000 is required to eliminate this backlog;

Whereas the Department of Defense has the authority under section 2012 of title 10, United States Code, to provide support and services to Federal entities, including the National Park Service;

Whereas the Civil-Military Department of Defense Innovative Readiness Training Program is designed to improve military readiness while helping to rebuild the United States through realistic, hands-on training opportunities for military personnel which simultaneously assists with meeting domestic priorities;

Whereas the Civil-Military Department of Defense Innovative Readiness Training Program is in keeping with a long military tradition by leveraging real world training opportunities to meet the readiness requirements of military units and individuals while benefitting local communities;

Whereas this support and service provided by the Department of Defense includes equipment and other assistance which would aid in reducing the backlog of maintenance and other like projects identified by the National Park Service; and

Whereas a partnership between the Civil-Military Department of Defense Innovative Readiness Training Program and the National Park Service can provide the American taxpayer with added benefits: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the National Park Service should immediately take full advantage of the support and services offered by the Department of Defense pursuant to section 2012 of title 10, United States Code, in addressing the backlog of maintenance and other like projects within units of the National Park System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that the American public likes the very most is our national parks. We have about 375 units of the Park Service. These are the areas that if we ask the American public what do they like the very most in the world, they will say the parks. They go to all the parks. From sea to shining sea, they see these parks and they love them. In fact, they love them to death. Because of that, we have a tremendous backlog of infrastructure in the parks.

For those folks out West, they fully realize that Yellowstone had impassable roads for a long time. These roads were put there in 1915 by the cavalry. There was not even any base for them. Go down to the Grand Canyon and they

had a culinary water system problem that they had to rely upon the people in Arizona. Keep looking around and a few years ago we had a backlog of infrastructure that was probably around \$15 billion.

□ 1445

We did not know how to take care of this problem. Well, here are the people demanding that they go into these parks, and they want them to be beautiful. They want the roads to be right, they want the restrooms to work, they want the ranger to stand there and explain things to them that they want to hear. They want to go home and they want to have their pictures developed and they want to see these beautiful, gorgeous parks where they enjoyed the 3 weeks that they got off, or whatever it was.

Well, the question always comes up to this committee, and has as long as I have been on the committee, which is 10 terms, of how do we take care of these parks and the infrastructure?

A couple of terms ago we started the Demonstration Program, really a good idea, which meant that now people going in the parks would spend a little more than that \$10. In Yellowstone you could go in in 1915 for \$10. In 1996 you could go in for \$10. Where is the best deal in the world? It is right there. Take the wife and the kids and go out to dinner and a show and you will spend \$100, you get to see these gorgeous parks for \$10.

So we started this Demonstration Program which in effect said to the superintendent, up the ante a little bit. Let us pay a little more for it. The criticism of that has been infinitesimal, it has been minimal, almost nonexistent, because people have said that is the best deal in America, is our national parks.

Still, Mr. Speaker, we go back to the issue, how do we take care of the infrastructure of the parks? Admittedly the Demonstration Program worked pretty well.

Well, we had an interesting thing happen about 1993. A colonel that was the head of the Corps of Engineers came over to my office and he said, "Congressman, I would like to answer a question for you of how we could take care of the national parks."

I said, Yes, sir, boy, we want to hear that.

He said, Well, the Corps of Engineers go all over the world, and they build roads, and they build bridges, and they build hospitals, and they are doing things in Indonesia, Somalia, South Africa, you name it. So we take this Corps of Engineers and we put them in C-141s and we take the patrols, we take their bulldozers and we take their engineers and we go over and build a road for them.

Well, that is a good humanitarian thing to do, and I guess we all feel good about it.

He said, But, Congressman, our guys would rather stay in the United States.

They would rather go up and build that road in Yellowstone, because mom and the kids can come up for those 3 weeks and they can enjoy it. So at one time the engineers from the State of Utah are there and a month later the people from Arizona are there and a month later the people from Minnesota are there and they do the road.

What do they do? We are paying for it anyway because we are training these youngsters, we are training these officers and enlisted men to understand this. So they do the engineering. They are going to do it anyway, whether it is Somalia or it is Yellowstone. They are going to do the work, whether it is there. The money will come out for it. But the difference is the American taxpayer now is the beneficiary of their good work.

So we thought that was a great idea. I talked to the Director of the National Park System. He said it is a wonderful idea. Then it kind of got bogged down in a few things, and we determined we could not do a bill that straight.

So this bill that we have before us today kind of encourages that, and says to the Department of Defense, look, folks, come on and help us out in some of these parks.

Look at the advantage of this, Mr. Speaker. For one thing, the Corps of Engineers does the engineering, they bring their tools in; they do the work. And what does the Park Service pay for? The Park Service pays for the material, the road base, the cement, the things like that. So you cut your costs rather substantially.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, look at this. Where are our parks? They are not in the middle of areas like Washington, D.C. or Salt Lake City. They are way out there somewhere. People have to drive to them. So how do you get people to come in and say yes, we will bid on this. They bid all right, but they really bid high prices and you will pay four or five times more than you will in a metropolitan area.

Then you have that Davis-Bacon Act staring you in the face, and I will not get into that, even though I have strong feelings on it, that also comes back and hits us right between the eyeballs. So this costs a lot of money.

But what about the American taxpayer? He wants a nice park. They want to enjoy it. They want to go in there, and they want someone to revel in it. And they do go to our national parks in America. The best liked thing which is done in the U.S. Government is the National Park System.

Mr. Speaker, this is kind of an easy little bill, but it encourages the Corps of Engineers, the Department of Defense, to work with the Park Service, save us some money, make our parks better, so that the American people can enjoy these parks.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, simply put, House Resolution 182 is a good idea. This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that would help solve

a big problem the National Park Service has in trying to maintain our national parks while also taking advantage of an assistance program already established in the Department of Defense. This would be especially effective in national parks that are isolated and do not have commercial contractors reasonably available.

As we all know, one of the primary purposes of the National Park Service is to provide for the public enjoyment of our national parks. In order to accomplish this, units of the National Park Service have understandably constructed buildings, roads, and other related infrastructure and facilities. However, for many years now the National Park Service has repeatedly reported a backlog of projects necessary to maintain facilities, structures, roads, and other infrastructure within our parks. In fact, the Park Service has asserted that upwards of \$8 billion is required to correct this backlog.

Separately, the Department of Defense has the statutory authority to provide support and services to other Federal agencies and entities, including the National Park Service. This support comes in the form of the Civil-Military Department of Defense Innovative Readiness Training Program which is designed to improve military readiness while providing hands-on training opportunities for military personnel. This support service includes equipment and other assistance which could substantially aid in reducing the backlog of maintenance and other like projects identified by the National Park Service. Furthermore, the men and women in the Army involved in these projects and who need the training would do it here in this country, and would not have to travel half way across the world. They also would be much closer to their families. In fact, many families might want to travel to parks where their loved ones are working.

In short, Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 182 uses assistance from the Army to help solve the maintenance problem in our national parks thereby, benefiting the American taxpayer in this country instead of deployed overseas somewhere.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 182. This is a good idea and good for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 182 expresses the sense of the House that the National Park Service should immediately take full advantage of a Department of Defense readiness training program in addressing the backlog of maintenance within units of the National Park System.

House Resolution 182 is being brought to the House under unusual circumstances. The resolution was discharged from the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands and marked up by the Committee on Resources just last week. We had no hearings on the measure in the committee, despite the fact that this proposal has been pending before the committee

since May 1999. We did not receive the views of the administration or other interested parties on this measure. As a result, we do not know what this defense program does or could do, nor to what extent this program has been previously used by the National Park Service or other land management agencies.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Utah (Chairman HANSEN) has described this as a non-controversial measure to encourage the use of an existing defense program in making needed repair to the infrastructure of our national park units. We have no objection to this nonbinding resolution, but we would like to have it understood that such assistance is to be carried out in conformance with the applicable laws and regulations and with the recognition of the high value placed on preserving and protecting national park resources.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 182.

The question was taken.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEKAS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### MIWALETA PARK EXPANSION ACT

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1725) to provide for the conveyance by the Bureau of Land Management to Douglas County, Oregon, of a county park and certain adjacent land.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1725

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Miwaleta Park Expansion Act".

#### SEC. 2. LAND CONVEYANCE, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND, DOUGLAS COUNTY, OREGON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) CONVEYANCE.—The Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this section as the "Secretary") shall convey, without consideration, to Douglas County, Oregon (referred to in this section as the "County"), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of land (including improvements on the land) described in paragraph (2) and consisting of—

(A) Miwaleta Park, a county park managed under agreement by the County on Federal land managed by the Bureau of Land Management; and

(B) an adjacent tract of Federal land managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—The parcel of land referred to in paragraph (1) is the parcel in the SW  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the NE  $\frac{1}{4}$ ; SE  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the NW  $\frac{1}{4}$  of sec. 27, T31S, R4W, W.M., Douglas County, Oregon, described as follows:

The property lying between the southerly right-of-way line of the relocated Cow Creek County Road No. 36 and contour elevation 1881.5 MSL, comprising approximately 28.50 acres.

(b) USE OF LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After conveyance of land under subsection (a), the County may manage and exercise any program or policy that the County considers appropriate in the use of the land for park purposes.

(2) REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary determines that the land conveyed under subsection (a) is not being used for park purposes—

(i) all right, title, and interest in and to the land, including any improvements on the land, shall revert to the United States; and

(ii) the United States shall have the right of immediate entry onto the land.

(B) DETERMINATION ON THE RECORD.—Any determination of the Secretary under subparagraph (A) shall be made on the record.

(c) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the land to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary and paid for by the County.

(d) IMPACT ON FERC WITHDRAWAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The conveyance of land under subsection (a) shall have no effect on the conditions and rights provided in Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Withdrawal No. 7161.

(2) CONFLICTS.—In a case of conflict between the use of the conveyed land as a park and the purposes of the withdrawal, the purposes of the withdrawal shall prevail.

(e) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—Except as provided in subsection (c), costs associated with the conveyance under subsection (a) shall be borne by the party incurring the costs.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO) EACH WILL CONTROL 20 MINUTES.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1725, introduced by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. Speaker, a significant amount of effort has gone into the preparation of this bill, and I would like to begin by commending the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) for their diligence in bringing this legislation to the floor.

Miwaleta Park, located in Oregon, is a 30-acre area jointly managed by the Bureau of Land Management and Douglas County. The title to this park and surrounding area is currently held by the BLM. Under H.R. 1725, the title, and all rights and interest of this land, would be transferred to Douglas County for the purpose of building a public campground.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate my support for H.R. 1725, and ask for the endorsement of all Members to pass this needed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1725 authorizes the conveyance of approximately 29 acres of public land to Douglas County, Oregon for park purposes. Currently 25 acres of the land proposed to be conveyed are used as a county park, Miwaleta Park, under an agreement between the county and the Bureau of Land Management.

The county has been working with the Bureau of Land Management to develop a campground on four adjacent acres, but this development has been complicated by the site's location within a Late Successional Reserve designated by the Northwest Forest Plan. However, the Bureau of Land Management has completed an environmental assessment that concluded the county could proceed with the proposed campground development.

Douglas County and the Bureau of Land Management had previously discussed conveying the land in question under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act, but that procession was abandoned because current law does not allow Oregon and California lands to be transferred or leased. The land transfer contained in H.R. 1725 is an alternative to other administrative processes available to deal with these lands.

We should note that the legislation the House is considering today is different from a related Senate bill, S. 977, that the Senate passed late last year. We hope that the remaining issues between the two versions of the legislation can be satisfactorily resolved so that this legislative initiative can be finalized and sent to the President for his signature.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I thank him for his help with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a long and difficult process for Douglas County to improve and obtain the properties adjacent to their park in order that they might provide for camping facilities and might make this area more desirable for hundreds of families each year.

The Miwaleta Park is adjacent to a reservoir. It is heavily recreated now, and we have problems because of dispersed camping in the area. This park is actually going to, with the development of facilities by the county, ameliorate existing problems that we have with the dispersed camping and trash

and other problems, and provide for a family camping experience, provide for sanitary facilities, and really enhance the experience for everyone.

The Secretary of the Interior will continue to have the right to revoke title if the county does not maintain these lands for parks. I am fully confident that Douglas County will substantially invest in and manage this property very well, but, in order to meet concerns that some have expressed, we included that in the legislation.

We also, in going through and evaluating this legislation, determined that in fact the environmental impacts would be positive, not negative; that by cutting down on the dispersed camping and the sanitation and trash problems with the developed facility and concentrating the camping activities in a smaller area, that a number of problems would also be ameliorated.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of people have contributed to this legislation. Douglas County, of course, has been persistent in dealing with the Bureau of Land Management over 8 long years and working with me. Former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, BOB SMITH, supported the bill in the last Congress. My colleague the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) was very supportive and a cosponsor of the legislation in this Congress, as well as the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Utah (Chairman HANSEN). Of course on the Senate side, we have had support from the Oregon delegation. I have great support from staff, both Rick Healy now as staff and my former staff, Jeff Steer.

So it has been a long time, but sometimes good things take a very long time. After 8 long years, the people of Douglas County in the very near future will have greatly enhanced camping facilities available so that they might enjoy Oregon's summer on this wonderful body of water.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair for his support.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1725.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1500

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1680, H. Res. 182, and H.R. 1725, the three bills just debated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEKAS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

#### CAPTAIN COLIN P. KELLY, JR. POST OFFICE

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1666) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service at 200 East Pinckney Street in Madison, Florida, as the "Captain Colin P. Kelly, Jr. Post Office".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1666

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 200 East Pinckney Street in Madison, Florida, is hereby designated as the "Captain Colin P. Kelly, Jr. Post Office". Any reference to such facility in a law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the "Captain Colin P. Kelly, Jr. Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHUGH) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHUGH).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1666.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD) is to be credited today for his initiative and his work in introducing this bill which has just been noted designates the facility of the United States Postal Service at 200 East Pinckney Street in Madison, Florida, as the Captain Colin P. Kelly, Jr. Post Office.

For the record, Mr. Speaker, I would note the Congressional Budget Office has reviewed the legislation and has determined that the enactment of this bill would have no significant impact on the Federal budget. Spending by the Postal Service is classified as off-budget and thus is not subject to pay-as-you-go procedures. As well, the bill contains no intergovernmental or private sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and, as such, would impose no costs on State, local, or tribal governments.

I would also, Mr. Speaker, like to thank the gentleman from Philadel-

phia, Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the ranking member of the subcommittee, for his continuous cooperation, certainly on this bill, but on all of these initiatives that we have tried to develop through the subcommittee and for his work on behalf of his side; and the support of the full committee; and the chairman of that full committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), as always is greatly appreciated.

I should say that this legislation continues what I think is a very admirable record of the subcommittee and of this House of expressing its admiration through these designations for individuals and citizens who have served their communities and have served their countries well.

Today, we are marking a gentleman who has really put forward heroic efforts and a gentleman who has been widely recognized as our Nation's first World War II hero and, in fact, Time Magazine, in its issue of December 22 of 1941 stated, "If heroism can be compared, the most illustrious of America's first heroes was Captain Colin Kelly, Jr. His citation was recorded in a single pregnant sentence of a communique issued by General Douglas MacArthur who said, 'General MacArthur announced with great sorrow the death of Captain Colin Kelly, Jr., who so distinguished himself by scoring three direct hits on the Japanese capital battleship *Haruna*, leaving her in flames and in distress.'"

It is indeed fitting that the Post Office in Madison, Florida, be named after Mr. Kelly, who was born in that community in the year of 1915. He graduated from that community's high school in 1932. Thereafter, he entered West Point in 1933, graduated, and was assigned to B-17 fighter group. He was the first Army officer to fly the Boeing Flying Fortress in the Far East.

At the time of his early demise on December 10 of 1941, Colin Kelly was survived by his wife and his young son, Colin P. Kelly, III.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, we are indebted to our friend and colleague for bringing this legislation forward. I know that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD) is here on the floor and will wish to make some comments, but he has our gratitude and our admiration in making this effort to identify a gentleman who has done his Nation, his community, and his family so much good, and we appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHUGH). Not only have we worked together on these initiatives, I still remain hopeful that we are going to work together and find a way to provide some modernization for our postal services. I want to thank him for his efforts legislatively leading this Chamber in that direction.

Let me say that in terms of the bill in front of us, I rise in support of H.R.

1666, authored by my friend and colleague from the great State of Florida (Mr. BOYD). It honors a gentleman who is a true American hero, someone who faced adversity, found himself and stood and provided the leadership that was required, sacrificing himself in so many ways to help those members of his crew. We are going to hear more about this story of Colin P. Kelly, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD), the prime sponsor and author of this bill and a member of my caucus and someone who wants to bring this story and make it live in the naming of this postal facility in Madison, Florida.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), my friend and the ranking member of the subcommittee; and I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) for shepherding this legislation to the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, today I want to speak in support of this legislation, which I introduced to honor a fellow North Floridian who earned the distinction of becoming World War II's first hero. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1666 would designate the post office building in Madison, Florida, the Captain Colin P. Kelly, Jr. Post Office.

Colin Kelly was born in Monticello, Florida, my hometown, on July 11, 1915, as the chairman said. He was raised in Madison, Florida, where he attended Madison High School, receiving his diploma in 1932. The following summer, young Colin accepted an appointment to the United States Military Academy at West Point. After graduating in 1937, he was assigned to the Army Air Corps flight school and became a Boeing B-17 Flying Fortress pilot.

At the outbreak of World War II, Captain Kelly, along with several other B-17 crews, was stationed at Clark Field in the Philippines. Once his unit was deployed to Clark Field, he became the first Army officer to fly the Boeing Flying Fortress in the Far East.

Shortly after the bombing of Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, Captain Kelly and his crew received orders to attack the Japanese invasion fleet that was threatening the Philippines. After completing their bombing run, Captain Kelly's plane was attacked by two Japanese fighters and was badly damaged while returning to Clark Field.

Realizing that his plane would not make it back to base, Captain Kelly gave the order to abandon the aircraft, but he remained at the controls to maintain the plane's altitude so his crew could safely bail out. Because of his heroic efforts, because of Captain Kelly's heroic efforts, six of his crewmen survived. Unfortunately, this courageous act meant that he did not have time to bail out himself, and he went down with his plane and was killed in the line of duty on December 10, 1941.

At that time, America was experiencing the attack at Pearl Harbor and

the outbreak of World War II and was in search of an American hero. Captain Colin P. Kelly, Jr. became that first American hero of World War II.

According to Major Kenneth Gantz in a memo to General William Hall dated November 21, 1945, Kelly became a hero by circumstances at a time when his country desperately needed a hero. In recognition of his bravery and honor, President Roosevelt awarded Captain Kelly the Distinguished Service Cross posthumously for his actions; and many popular publications of the day highlighted his heroism. Because of this, again, he is often considered America's first hero of World War II.

Captain Kelly is survived by one son, Colin P. "Corky" Kelly, III. In 1956 Colin Kelly, III received an appointment to West Point, was finished there, became an Army officer, finished a stellar career in the Army and currently serves in the ministry in New Mexico. His sister, Captain Colin P. Kelly Jr.'s sister, is surviving in Madison today, and she and her children are personal friends of this Member.

Captain Kelly's courage and sacrifice in the line of duty stands as a lasting example for the citizens of Madison County and for all Americans. He deserves both the respect and admiration of everyone for his dedication to our country. The naming of the post office in his hometown of Madison as the Captain Colin P. Kelly, Jr. Post Office will be a wonderful and lasting tribute to this patriot, his family, and his legacy.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in honoring this American hero, and I urge passage of H.R. 1666.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, fully and enthusiastically supporting this bill, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, there is little I can add to the sponsor's very eloquent words, but again I would just like to express our appreciation to him for helping this House today in recognizing an extraordinary man with this very, very due and owing honor. I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1666.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 7 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 7 p.m.

□ 1900

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) at 7 p.m.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 8162(c)(3) of Public Law 106-79, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission:

Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas,  
Mr. MORAN of Kansas,  
Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and  
Mr. BOSWELL of Iowa.

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

House Concurrent Resolution 288, by the yeas and nays;

House Resolution 182, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

#### RECOGNIZING IMPORTANCE OF FAMILIES AND CHILDREN IN UNITED STATES AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR GOALS AND IDEAS OF NATIONAL FAMILY DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H.Con.Res. 288.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 288, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 0, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

YEAS—392

Abercrombie	Baker	Bartlett
Aderholt	Baldacci	Barton
Allen	Baldwin	Bass
Andrews	Ballenger	Bentsen
Archer	Barcia	Bereuter
Armey	Barr	Berkley
Baca	Barrett (NE)	Berry
Baird	Barrett (WI)	Biggart

Kuykendall  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Lantos  
Largent  
Larson  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
LoBiondo  
LoFgren  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Luther  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Mascara  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCrery  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Metcalfe  
Mica  
Millender-  
    McDonald  
Miller (FL)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Ose  
Owens  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Pease  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Phelps  
Pickering  
Pickett  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Portman  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Reyes



Reynolds	Simpson	Tiahrt
Riley	Sisisky	Tierney
Rivers	Skeen	Toomey
Rodriguez	Skelton	Towns
Roemer	Slaughter	Traficant
Rogan	Smith (MI)	Turner
Rogers	Smith (NJ)	Udall (CO)
Rohrabacher	Smith (WA)	Udall (NM)
Ros-Lehtinen	Snyder	Upton
Roukema	Souder	Velazquez
Roybal-Allard	Spence	Vento
Ryan (WI)	Spratt	Visclosky
Ryun (KS)	Stabenow	Vitter
Sabo	Stark	Walden
Salmon	Stearns	Walsh
Sanchez	Stenholm	Wamp
Sanders	Strickland	Waters
Sandlin	Stump	Watkins
Sanford	Stupak	Watt (NC)
Sawyer	Sununu	Watts (OK)
Saxton	Sweeney	Waxman
Scarborough	Talent	Weldon (FL)
Schaffer	Tancred	Weldon (PA)
Scott	Tanner	Weller
Sensenbrenner	Tauscher	Wexler
Serrano	Tauzin	Weygand
Sessions	Taylor (MS)	Whitfield
Shadegg	Taylor (NC)	Wicker
Shaw	Terry	Wilson
Shays	Thomas	Wise
Sherman	Thompson (CA)	Wolf
Sherwood	Thompson (MS)	Woolsey
Shimkus	Thornberry	Wu
Shows	Thune	Wynn
Shuster	Thurman	Young (AK)

## NAYS—2

Chenoweth-Hage Paul

## NOT VOTING—40

Ackerman	Gordon	McDermott
Bachus	Greenwood	McNulty
Bateman	Gutierrez	Meenan
Becerra	Houghton	Pallone
Berman	Jackson-Lee	Payne
Blagojevich	(TX)	Porter
Blunt	Johnson, E.B.	Rothman
Crane	Jones (OH)	Royce
Davis (IL)	Klink	Rush
Delahunt	Lipinski	Schakowsky
Doolittle	Lowe	Smith (TX)
Engel	Martinez	Weiner
Eshoo	Matsui	Young (FL)
Ewing	McCollum	

□ 1934

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3844

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 3844.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 701

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 701.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 3573, THE KEEP OUR PROMISES TO AMERICA'S MILITARY RETIREES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this government offered a comprehensive employment contract to our military retirees. As a former member of the armed services, I was personally presented the package in the 1960s. I remember the sales pitch quite well, for the Army was very honest in pointing out the pros and cons of a military career.

The negatives were, first, that you might get killed or maimed in the line of duty but if you survived, you would have to move your family from one side of the country to the other every couple of years, maybe even overseas, and you would be paid far less than you would in a similar skill civilian job in spite of having to deal with these hardships. The supposedly offsetting positives were that your out-of-pocket living expenses would be far less, since major expense items such as health care would be covered directly by the Army, both during your active duty years and in retirement. Retirement was available after 20 years of service at half of your last paycheck.

Therefore, we were told we could afford to work and retire for far less than our jobs would command in the private sector or the Federal civilian workforce, for that matter, because of all of these great benefits. We would not need a big retirement check since we would have fully funded health care for life.

We could live off a lot less since we would never face big health care bills. I was homesick for Georgia the last time I heard that pitch in the Republic of Vietnam in 1969, so I passed on the deal. Air Force Sergeant Earl Terrell of Smyrna, Tennessee, took the government at its word and stayed in for over 21 years. Sergeant Terrell retired in Smyrna because of access to military benefits at the Smyrna Air Force Base. His retirement pay is \$14,676 a year for both Earl and his wife. That is below

the Federal poverty line, but that did not bother the couple that much since they would not have to worry about health care costs so they could live off the entire \$14,000.

The deal started to go sour 6 years after Sergeant Terrell settled down in Smyrna when the Federal Government closed down the Smyrna Air Force Base. Sergeant Terrell has suffered a stroke and had heart bypass surgery. Mrs. Terrell had heart valve surgery just in January and has also undergone surgeries for an ovarian cyst and back problems.

Without access to military health care, Earl and his wife now are paying \$5,760 a year to Blue Cross and Blue Shield. That is 39 percent of his retirement income. That leaves the Terrells with less than \$9,000 a year to live on. The Federal poverty line for a family of two is over \$16,000. Since 1995, the Terrells have paid nearly \$29,000 of their retirement income for health care that was promised free in exchange for 20 years of military service.

Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of this House, I ask you, have we fulfilled our side of the employment contract with Air Force Sergeant Earl Terrell? The answer is unequivocally no. We have a bill pending in the House and Senate that will meet our promises to those who have borne the battle, H.R. 3573.

Sergeant and Mrs. Terrell would be given the same FEHBP plan as our retired Federal civilian workers, at no cost. That means they regain their \$14,000 a year retirement pay, still below the poverty line but at least what they were promised.

At last check, the majority of the Members of this House from both parties have cosponsored this bill, The Keep Our Promises to America's Military Retirees Act. Mr. Speaker, let us try to do the right thing and let America keep her word and her honor and pass H.R. 3573 into law before this Congress ends.

#### IN OPPOSITION TO S. 1287, THE NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in 1983, President Reagan signed into law the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. The new law began with a reasonable scientific approach. The country would search all over the Nation looking for geological formations which were capable of burying high-level nuclear waste. The new law would also consider three sites so as to provide some regional equity to the burden of storing the waste. One site would be in the northeastern part of the country, one site would be in the southeastern United States, and one site would be in the West. These three sites would be studied and then presented to the President of the United States for a decision.

Since then, politics has had more to say to the siting of high-level nuclear waste than the science. After Members of Congress from the Northeast began to openly oppose placing the dump in the Northeast, the Department of Energy unilaterally decided to take them off the list. When placing the dump in the southeastern part of the country came up as a campaign issue in 1984, President Reagan unilaterally decided to take the southeastern part of the country off the list.

These decisions were not based on science, Mr. Speaker. They were based on politics. Then in 1987, the so-called "screw Nevada" bill was passed into law. This bill made the most political of decisions, to designate one site, Yucca Mountain, as the only site, excluding any other consideration from any other region in the country. So if I begin to question the claims of science from the supporters of dumping nuclear waste in Nevada, it is because I have learned to question from the history of this issue.

Fast forward to the mid 1990s. Nearly a decade has gone by since the "screw Nevada" bill and the scientific evidence against Yucca Mountain is growing. It has become scandalously obvious that Yucca Mountain was the wrong mountain to bet on. It is in an earthquake zone, it is in an underground flooding zone, it is in a volcanic eruption zone, for crying out loud.

On top of that we find out that the rocks at Yucca Mountain cannot contain radiation like the politicians had hoped. So back to the drawing boards to find another way to screw Nevada.

By 1995, illogical legislation took a new direction, something called a temporary storage site in Nevada. The nuclear industry figured they could build a temporary site because it would not have to meet the strict standards of a permanent dump, and once the waste was in Nevada, it would never leave.

But a funny thing happened on the way to a temporary dump. President Clinton promised to veto it and that threat, coupled with the hard work of some Members of the House and the Senate, has frozen the temporary concept for half of a decade.

But now, given that the temporary dump will not fly, we see S. 1287. This is nothing but a transparent effort to throw out radiation standards and sneak the date several years closer for shipping nuclear waste to Nevada. This is nothing but a temporary dump proposal in disguise. The President recognizes that and will veto S. 1287, and the Senate vote already proves the veto will be sustained.

Can we get off this act of futility and move on to worrying about the important issues that confront this Congress, that confront this country, education, health care, Social Security, and campaign finance reform? This is what our constituents want.

□ 1945

That is what the people of Nevada want. We will not stand for 1287, and I

ask my colleagues to join with me to stand up and oppose this onerous, ridiculous piece of legislation.

#### JUST SAY NO TO FUNDS FOR COLOMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, we are about to spend almost \$2 billion to escalate the war on drugs in Colombia, while here in the United States 26 million American addicts and alcoholics go untreated.

We have already spent over \$600 million to eradicate drugs at their source in Colombia. And what has happened? Both cocaine and heroin production in Colombia have more than doubled.

Colombia is now the source of 80 percent of the cocaine and 75 percent of the heroin in the United States. Let us face it, our supply-side efforts have been a colossal failure.

Congress and the President need to wake up and face reality. Over the last 10 years, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has spent \$150 billion to combat the supply of illegal drugs. Yet the cocaine market is glutted, as always, and heroin is readily available at record high purities. The number of hard-core addicts continues to increase every day.

Our drug eradication and interdiction efforts have also been a costly failure. As a former United States Navy Commander who led such efforts in Colombia for 3 years said recently, quote, "The \$1.7 billion being proposed on drug-fighting efforts in Colombia is good money thrown after bad."

Retired Navy Lieutenant Commander Sylvester Salcedo also said, and I am quoting again, "We cannot make any progress on this drug issue by escalating our presence in Colombia. Instead, we should confront the issue of demand in the United States by providing treatment services to our addicted population."

Mr. Speaker, we need to listen to this veteran of the war on drugs who added, "Washington should spend its money not on helicopters and trainers but on treatment for addicts."

The \$400 million cost of helicopters alone for Colombia would provide treatment for 200,000 Americans addicted to drugs.

Mr. Speaker, this is crazy. This is wrong. We are about to spend \$2 billion on Colombia for drug eradication and interdiction while most of the 26 million addicts and alcoholics in the United States are unable to access treatment. We are about to spend \$2 billion on Colombia even though treatment has been proven to be 23 times more cost effective than eradication of crops and 11 times more cost effective than interdiction.

When will Congress and the President wake up to the basic fact that our Na-

tion's supply-side strategy does not attack the underlying problem of addiction? It is the addiction that causes people to crave and demand drugs.

When President Richard Nixon declared war on drugs in 1971, he directed 60 percent of the funding to treatment. Now we are down to 18 percent of the funding for treatment. That is a big reason, Mr. Speaker, that fully one half of the treatment beds are gone that were available here in America 10 years ago. The other reason is that we allow insurance companies to discriminate against the disease of addiction by limiting access to treatment.

Mr. Speaker, this is a defining moment in the 30-year effort to curb illegal drug use in the United States. We can keep pumping money into that supply-side cesspool or we can shift our focus to the drug addiction problem here at home. We will never stop the drug epidemic unless we cut off the insatiable demand for drugs in our Nation.

It is time to reject the \$2 billion for the failed policy in Colombia. It is time to redirect those resources to providing access to drug treatment here at home.

Mr. Speaker, the American people literally, literally, cannot afford to wait any longer for Congress to get real about addiction in America, the number one public health and public safety problem in our Nation.

I hope and pray my fellow colleagues will just say no to funds for Colombia.

#### TODAY UNITED STATES SETS AN ALL-TIME RECORD DEFICIT IN TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the United States set another record today. Unfortunately, it is not a record of which we can be proud as a nation or certainly not as one of the policy-makers that helps set our trade policy in this country.

We set a record deficit, an all-time record deficit, in trade. \$338.9 billion trade deficit, a 50 percent increase from the 1998 level of \$220.6 billion. Now, what does that mean? Well, let us think about it for a minute. Where is all that money coming from and where is it going?

Well, since trade policy in this country is pretty much dictated to the Members of Congress, this Member excepted but most of my colleagues, or a majority, and to the White House downtown, no matter it seems which party is sitting there, by multinational corporations, they do not really care what the impact is on the United States of America, its workers or our economic future. But guess what? We are piling up a huge mound of international debt and some day that debt is going to be called and it is going to wreak havoc with the economy of our country.

According to most recent statistics, our international debt, because of this huge and growing trade deficit, will reach \$1.9 trillion when it is added up for last year, and they are expecting it will double to \$3.8 trillion, trillion dollars, by the year 2005.

Interest payments, money going overseas for money borrowed from overseas by financiers, governments, multinational corporations, whatever, \$86 billion this year and it will be \$166 billion by 2005. That is jobs that are not created here, capital that is not available here, threats to the future economic prosperity of our country.

Now, there are two parts of the trade deficit we ought to take a special close look at. One is the trade deficit due to the OPEC nations. Now, people have just started to pay attention to OPEC again recently, but they have been there all along. They have been a very large part of our trade deficit, but they are getting bigger.

Last month, our trade deficit to the OPEC nations, because of their price fixing, was \$2.671 billion. That means at that rate we will run a \$31 billion trade deficit with OPEC.

Now, everybody around here loves free trade, the World Trade Organization, with the exception of a few of us who think that that is not working very well for the people of this Nation. Well, the WTO has rules. Guess what? They have rules. It is a rules-based trade. The President loves rules-based trade, and one of the rules is that member nations cannot constrain production for goods produced for export unless it is for conservation purposes.

Nobody in the OPEC nations pretends that they are conserving their oil for conservation purposes. They are real up front about it. They are price gouging. They are creating an artificial shortage. Why then will the President and the administration not file a complaint in the WTO that they love so much? Why will the majority party who loves the WTO so much not force the President to file a complaint?

I expect they will not allow my amendment to the legislation tomorrow that would resolve that the Congress wants the President to file a complaint in the WTO against the OPEC nations.

Now there is another aspect to this that is very large, even bigger than OPEC. China, our trade deficit with China close to \$70 billion this last year, an increase of 15 percent, the most unfair trading nation on earth. And yet what is this Congress proposing to do, pushed by the Republican leaders and the President? That is to give China everything they ever wanted, to give up any tools that this body holds to hold over China in the future to get them to behave in international trade, to get them to behave in human rights, to get them to behave in nonproliferation of nuclear weapons or dealing weapons to terrorist countries, to give them permanent most favored nation status.

Well, the estimates are, by our own international trade commission, saying that if the U.S. gets China into the WTO and if the U.S. grants them permanent most favored nation status, that they expect, according to their model, that our trade deficit with China will grow for the next 60 years to \$649 billion. Something stinks about the trade policy in this country and it is time that it changes.

#### WE HAVE OUR GREAT LAKES BACK BUT WE ARE NOW FACING A NEW THREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, just 30 years ago, the Great Lakes had been all but pronounced dead. Lake Erie was filled with garbage, and rotting fish regularly washed up on the beach. The Cuyahoga River, which flows into Lake Erie, was so polluted that in 1969 it caught fire. Lake trout in Lake Michigan and Lake Huron were all but wiped out. The Federal Government even banned the consumption of walleye because of the high levels of toxic mercury.

Today, however, we can say that through dedication and hard work, the Great Lakes are one of environmentalism's most dramatic success stories. Lake Michigan's fish population has recovered with steelhead, salmon, and brown trout. Lake trout and lower Huron and Superior are recovering rapidly as well. We have our Great Lakes back, but now we are facing a new threat.

Water scarcity is becoming a worldwide problem. Over 166 million people in 18 countries are suffering from water shortages. Almost 270 million more in 11 additional countries are considered water stressed. Experts predict that by 2025, one-fourth of the world will suffer from lack of water. Given the pressures of population increase and dropping water tables, present-day water usage cannot be sustained. Some are trying to change fresh water from a resource to a commodity.

Given these disturbing statistics, it is not surprising that there are now proposals to withdraw bulk quantities of water from the Great Lakes Basin. After all, the Great Lakes compromise one-fifth of the earth's fresh water resources, but we still do not know the effects that bulk water exports would have on the Great Lakes system.

In an effort to examine the environmental, economic, and social impact of bulk water removals from the Great Lakes, the United States and Canadian governments asked the International Joint Commission to report on this matter. Last week, the IJC released its final report.

The IJC reported that removals of water from the Great Lakes basin could reduce the resilience of the system and its capacity to cope with fu-

ture and unpredictable stresses. Despite its vastness, over 6 quadrillion gallons of water, the system is also extremely vulnerable to disruption. Any hydrological changes to the water system, even small changes, could have devastating ecological consequences.

Due to these environmental concerns, the IJC recommended a moratorium on such exports should be imposed for 2 years, to give the Great Lakes governors time to collect further data and assess the environmental impact of such removals. Most importantly, the IJC recommended that decisions regarding bulk exports should remain in the hands of those that are closest to this great resource, the State governments of the Great Lakes Region.

I grew up in Michigan and I know firsthand how important these lakes are to the States around them. They are not just a water resource. They are a way of life; from shipping to hydro power to tourism and recreation. Our Great Lakes communities rely on these water resources to support vital sectors of their economy. That is why I have introduced legislation, H.R. 2973, to not only protect our Great Lakes but also to ensure that those with the most vested interest in their future, the people who live in the Great Lakes States, are the ones who make the decisions about how they are managed.

For the past 15 years, the governors of the Great Lakes States, in consultation with the Canadian premiers, have effectively managed the basin. What we need to do now, and what my legislation will do, is impose a moratorium on bulk exports to give the governors the time that they need to effectively evaluate how and if any bulk exports from the Great Lakes basin should proceed.

We do not want to transfer management of the Great Lakes from the governors to the Federal Government. That is not the direction we should take.

Lake levels are at an all-time low. The Washington Post recently reported that Lake Superior is at 9 inches below its long-term average. Michigan and Huron were 18 inches below average. Erie was 9 inches below and Ontario was 5 inches low.

Now is the time to act on this matter. Prudent management of our natural resources means looking ahead and planning for the future. As we begin this century, we must be responsible stewards of our environment, to ensure that our children are not denied the resources that we did are able to enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge members of the Great Lakes States and all Members of Congress to join me in following the IJC's report and enacting H.R. 2973.

□ 2000

# A BEGGAR'S LIFE: U.S. POLICY MUST BE SOMETHING MORE THAN BEGGING AT OPEC'S DOORSTEP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago this month I made my first speech on the House floor, highlighting the importance of domestic oil production and our dangerous reliance upon imported oil. At that time oil was just under \$15 a barrel and gasoline was around 80 cents a gallon.

Within the following 12 months, the price of crude would fall to \$7.75 per barrel for western Kansas crude and would remain under \$10 per barrel for most of the next year. As a result of the dramatic price decline, since 1997 more than 136,000 wells were shut in and more than 41,000 jobs were lost in the oil and gas industry in our country. This amounts to 136,000 wells and 41,000 people not producing oil to meet our country's energy needs.

It was during that time that I introduced legislation aimed at reducing the cost of production for independent oil and gas producers. The bill seeks to boost domestic production by lowering the tax burden on small producers, increasing the credit for advanced oil recovery and calling for a strategic plan that would include additional research and development on secondary and tertiary oil recovery to address our national security needs.

While the focus now is on the cost of energy paid by the American consumer, the solution for today's consumer is the same as the solution for the problem of the independent oil and gas producer. We must encourage production in our domestic industry and limit our dependence on foreign supplies of petroleum.

The U.S. is currently importing around \$100 billion of oil a year, one-third of our country's \$300 billion trade deficit. High oil prices are a burden that we all bear. Kansas is a transportation-dependent State with normally cold winter weather. Whether it is the Kansas farmer preparing his field for spring planting, the trucker hauling wheat to the elevator, or the Kansas City commuter on her way to work, we all pay when our dependence on foreign oil becomes too great.

While we may be upset about the current situation, we cannot say that it comes as a surprise. In the last 7 years, U.S. oil production has fallen by nearly 20 percent, while oil consumption has risen by almost 15 percent. During the 25 years since the last oil crisis, our reliance on foreign oil has increased from 37 percent to nearly 60 percent today. America is now at its lowest oil production since World War II. We are importing 10.5 million barrels of oil a day, and that pattern is expected to only get worse. The Department of Energy

predicts that by the year 2010, a mere 10 years from now, we will import nearly 80 percent of our energy needs.

Today's higher crude prices alone are insufficient to increase domestic production, particularly in the short run. Kansas producers have lost much of their equity and find it very difficult to convince lenders to take the necessary risks to explore and develop new leases. When prices are dependent upon the actions of OPEC rather than only free market forces, the ability to take those risks necessary to find and produce new sources of oil are limited.

Does the small Kansas producer invest the necessary money, not knowing what the world price will be tomorrow? In Kansas the average daily production is 2.2 barrels per day per well. The cost per barrel is very high and the price received from that barrel determined by foreign suppliers. The stability which comes from greater control of our own destiny through increased domestic production is what is required.

The current situation is a clear signal for congressional action. The U.S. is producing less and less oil. Oil rigs and production have fallen by 77 percent since 1990. It is our obligation in Congress to develop tax policies, regulatory policies, and research funding that will allow us to raise domestic production to meet the future demands of the U.S. economy.

Our strategy for dealing with our future energy needs must be something more than simply begging at OPEC's doorstep.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## PUTTING THE FEDERAL BUDGET IN PERSPECTIVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I thought that I would take a little bit of time, uninterrupted time for a while, to kind of run through what we will anticipate happening this week on the presentation of the budget that will occur later in this week.

I think that it is very important that we try to put everything that we are going to do here this week in some kind of a perspective. It is very important that we take a look at where we were and where we are today, because rarely in regard to this Federal Government do we usually have a success story. It is very rare that we have success stories as it relates to Washington or the actions of the Congress, but I am a believer that whenever you have one,

you ought to tell that story, because there are a lot of people that become very cynical, a lot of young people who have very little faith in this system; and it is important to say that, while we as citizens ought to frankly be critical of our government, that is a healthy thing, it limits the size and the power of government, there are times when we ought to recognize the good things we do, and we ought to celebrate some of them.

That is not to say that government does not have its role. It does. But government's role ought to be limited. It ought to do things that cannot be accomplished in the private sector; and whatever it does do, it ought to do effectively, and we ought to have respect for it.

I think what has happened in our country over the period of the last 50 years is that government has tried to be all things to all people. Whether you want to be all things to all people in government or whether you want to be all things to all people as the manager of a baseball team, you cannot do it. You have to figure out what you want to concentrate on, because if you do not concentrate and have a few priorities, you will not do anything well.

I think there is a growing perception in the country, and it is a reality, that the Government does too many things and not enough things well.

Back when I first came to Congress in 1983, I was sworn in shortly after the beginning of 1983, if I were to have told you in those years that we were going to actually have a balanced budget, I would either have had to have been running for President making another promise that would not be fulfilled, or you would laugh at me.

In fact, just a short period of time ago, all the way in 1997, we were looking at deficits that were going to be in the hundreds of billions of dollars, adding to an already very large national debt, both a national debt comprised of money that we owe ourselves, our IOUs to programs like Social Security, plus raising the publicly held debt, which is the amount of money we owe to Americans who gave their money in exchange for bonds, government bonds that they held. This national debt was skyrocketing and our deficits were going up by hundreds of billions of dollars every single year.

Well, in 1997, after a long and hard fight that actually started before 1995, but when the Republicans finally took control of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate, we made a commitment that we were going to balance the budget by 2002. We said that we needed to stop the flow of red ink, that we needed to do this because our children really should not be saddled with these tremendous debts. I think that most Americans said that is exactly right; it is about time that we get ourselves in a situation where we are not going to ring up more and more debt.

When we came to power in 1995, we said that we would do whatever it took to balance this Federal budget, and we went through a lot of rocky roads, as I think everyone here knows; and it was a difficult process. We had to say as politicians that we were going to put our children and the economic strength of the country first, and the business of vote buying by using public funds, we were going to turn from that process.

There is a story, I do not really know if it is true, but there is a story that John Kennedy when he was running for public office was passing out silver dollars to the children, and somebody said, Well, Mr. Kennedy, if you get elected, you will not have to pass your own money out anymore; you will be able to use the public's money.

What politicians did was refuse to prioritize, just spend willy-nilly, trying to make every constituent group happy, without exhibiting proper leadership. Leadership is the ability of somebody to accept the notion that they may not be popular, but that they will in fact do what is in their heart and in their minds as the right thing and the moral thing. That is leadership.

So in 1995 and 1996 we had a very tough fight around here with the President of the United States, and in 1997 we sat down at the table with the President and we said that we really wanted to balance this budget. You remember how tough it was. It even involved a closing of the Government, which was really a statement. It was not about closing the Government; it was about the determination to try to change the course of the Government and try to change the course of Washington.

Last year a number of my colleagues came to me, foremost the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), who made an argument that it was just not good enough to balance the budget, because after that 1997 budget agreement, we, for the first time in a generation, actually were able to balance our books, the number of dollars flowing into the Government did not exceed the number of dollars flowing out.

So what the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) said was that was a great victory, but what we need to do is we need to stop borrowing from the Social Security surplus to fund the other programs of the Federal Government; that those surpluses of Social Security should either be used to pay existing benefits, or to be held in a way in which it would retire some of the national debt, not to be committed to other spending programs. It seemed like almost an impossible task.

Well, in last year's budget we actually constructed a budget that, for the first time in decades, in fact for the first time in perhaps even my lifetime, if I went back and checked it, and I do not want to be inaccurate on this, we did not borrow from Social Security to fund the other operations of the Government, which is amazing.

In fact, we used these surplus Social Security revenues, rather than committing them to other government programs that would have a life and require funding, we actually used that surplus to pay down some of the publicly held debt, for the first time, as one television commentator told me last night, since Harry Truman. A pretty good accomplishment.

We are going to come with a budget this year that we will be presenting this week on the House floor that will, for the second year, not take one single dime of the Social Security surplus and use it to fund any other programs of the Federal Government. In fact, what we will do with the Social Security dollars that flow into our treasury is we will use them first and foremost to pay the benefits of our Social Security recipients. For those extra dollars that are there, that surplus that is being collected at the present time, we will use that surplus to pay down \$1 trillion of the publicly held debt.

Now, I know there is this very popular show on television about wanting to be a millionaire. Whenever they have that show on television, they put a number up there about what the contestant is playing for. It gets to be \$50,000, \$10,000, I have not really studied the program. But people cheer. They cheer wildly when a person has an opportunity to go for \$250,000.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to take the bonds of the American people, or all the bondholders, and we are going to pay those bondholders off, and we are going to retire the publicly held debt by \$1 trillion. To me it is astounding. Had somebody told me just 5 years ago that not only would we be in balance and not only would we stay out of Social Security, but we would pay down the publicly held debt by \$1 trillion, I am an optimist, I would have said great; but I would not have expected it to happen.

What we will do in this Congress is to lock this money up so that it will either go for Social Security benefits or it will go to pay down debt.

On a personal note in this area, that in and of itself is not going to fix Social Security. What we are having happen in the country is the number of baby boomers who are going to retire are going to greatly exceed the number of people who get the benefits or the number of people who work to support those retirees.

□ 2015

See, right through, there are a zillion baby boomers supporting their parents; but in a few years when the baby boomers retire, the baby boomers did not have a lot of kids, so we are going to have a lot of baby boomers retire with very few workers, and the numbers will not add up, which is why it is essential that we ultimately come up with a significant solution to Social Security; and the quicker that we develop the solution and implement it, the better off we are.

Mr. Speaker, I have my own proposal that I would encourage my colleagues to examine. It would create private accounts; it would say that the Federal Government, along with a private board, would screen investment options, just like Federal employees have, and one could put one's money into approved programs of either stocks or stocks and bonds or just bonds; and using that concept, we would be able to solve our Social Security problems. It would require some sacrifice on the part of baby boomers about my age, but the Social Security system would be secured forever, and our children would be set free to be able to have more control over their retirement.

But the bottom line is, regardless of what plan we implement, we are going to have to deal with Social Security, and we are going to have to deal with it soon, because if we do not, we are going to have a meltdown. Before we actually implement that program, we want to protect all of those Social Security dollars so that they do not get committed to any other program and so that they be used just to fund Social Security and to pay down the public debt.

Secondly in this budget proposal, we are going to preserve and strengthen Medicare. Now, we do not know precisely what that program is going to look like. As my colleagues know, there is great discussion here about the issue of prescription drugs. I happen to believe that our seniors must have access to prescription drugs. Many of our seniors, God bless them, have the resources to purchase their own prescription drugs. So we ought to have a program that, in fact, means tests and offers this prescription drug benefit to the poorest of our senior citizens. Why is it so important? Well, there probably is not any other segment of our population that would respond as vibrantly to the opportunity to have prescription drugs as our seniors.

There are modern medical miracles. My wife and I, Karen, have two little children, two little baby girls, little Emma and little Reese. We love them and they are special, and of course we would do everything in our power to make sure that they can have the modern medical miracles that are available to children. But in this case, with Medicare and prescription drugs, we think that our seniors will be able to greatly respond to prescription drugs, in fact maybe even saving money, because they will be healthier. In fact, some surgeries can be avoided if, in fact, prescription drugs are available.

We do not know precisely what this program will look like. We do not know precisely what this program will cost. We do believe that any prescription drug program should be accompanied by an additional reform program for all of Medicare. Medicare is in final difficulty. We are going to have to rescue it. But we believe that any reform program ought to be coupled with a prescription drug program. We believe it

will strengthen Medicare and will help our seniors. That will also be provided for in this budget agreement; and as I have already mentioned, we will retire the public debt by 2013, but begin that by paying down \$1 trillion in the publicly held debt.

Now, that would be a pretty good budget in and of itself. Keep our mitts off Social Security, protect it, strengthen Medicare, reform Medicare, provide a prescription drug benefit to our poor seniors and retire \$1 trillion of the public debt. That would be a pretty good budget in and of itself. But we are not done there. We have some other things that we are doing in this budget, and one of the most significant things that we are doing is that we are cutting taxes.

Now, who are we going to cut taxes for? Well, first of all, the amount of tax cuts that are provided for in this budget proposal will, we think by the end of this summer, be in the vicinity of \$250 billion in tax cuts for Americans. Who would it affect? Well, we do not know who all the people are who are going to be affected, because all of the tax-cutting measures have not been designed yet, but we do know who we are starting with.

When a couple gets married today, many Americans experience a marriage penalty. If they were not married, they would pay lower taxes than when they get married. We think that that is really awfully silly, and I think probably 99 percent of all Americans feel that way. The fact is that this House has already acted to ease the penalty on married couples. We believe it ultimately ought to be eliminated. This budget bill that we bring up this week would provide the resources to ease the penalty on marriage. After all, the family, the health of the family, reflects the health of the society.

Secondly, we believe that family farmers, small business people, anybody who works as many hours as many of our entrepreneurs work, that these folks ought not to be penalized whenever they die. Today, when one dies, one has to visit the undertaker and the IRS on the same day; and they are going to take 55 percent of whatever it is that one owns.

Now, say one owns a family farm or, like my good friend out in Columbus, Max Peoples at the local pharmacy. Max works like you would not believe. You go in that store day or night, he is in there, he is working hard. Why would we, if something were to happen to Max and he wanted to pass this on to his family, why would we want to take 55 percent of his worth and give it to the Government. Are you kidding me?

Mr. Speaker, I would say this to my colleagues. Life on earth is short. As one philosopher said, the minute we get to be good at playing our instruments, it is time to put them down.

Well, I think it makes all the sense in the world to pass those instruments on to our children so they can continue

the symphony. And the fact is, whether it is a small business, all small businesses, or anybody who has worked hard for a living, at the end of their lives, they ought to be able to pass what they have on to their children so that their children can have a leg up, so that their children can be the beneficiaries of their parents' hard work.

For seniors, we believe this budget ought to reflect the opportunity of seniors to work longer and harder. Right now, if you are a senior citizen, you want to be independent, you want to work, they punish you by taking away your Social Security benefits. My opinion is that senior citizens are the greatest untapped resource we have in America. Youth brings energy and vitality; age brings wisdom. Frankly, I have seen a lot of wonderful people who have wisdom coupled with energy and vitality working even into their 80s. We want to reward our seniors. We do not want to say that if you want to be independent, you want to work a little bit, you want to have a job, we are going to punish you by cutting your Social Security benefits. This budget would allow us to fund the program that this House has already passed that would ease this penalty, this earnings test that we have imposed on senior citizens.

So for families, for small businesses, for any hard-working American, for our senior citizens, this bill would provide the resources to provide some tax fairness. But there will be other provisions as well in this bill, provisions that may provide for the ability to collect funds in an IRA account that can be used to help educate one's children, either in primary or secondary, or in college.

It could provide for cuts across the board. The marginal rates in this country are too high. We provide a significant amount of money for tax relief; and in fact, there has been discussion about whether this bill gets very close to being able to accomplish a lot of the ideas that Governor Bush has laid out in his tax cut program, and I would argue that this bill does. This is about \$250 billion in tax cuts when we add it all up, as compared to about \$300 billion in the Bush tax cut plan over the same period of time.

We are about \$50 billion away from where George Bush is. And I must tell my colleagues, \$50 billion away from a pot of money that represents, over 5 years, \$10 trillion, with a reforming President coupled with a reforming Congress, we will not only be able to provide the tax relieve that Governor Bush talks about, but we may be able to even do him one better. Mr. Speaker, we believe this is a very good down payment.

Now, people say that the American people do not want tax cuts. Well, I can tell my colleagues this: if you do not want to have a tax cut, I am going to give you one. If you do not like it, just send it to me and we will send it to Children's Hospital. How would that

be. Or you take your tax cut and give it to somebody who does not have much. That would be a good idea as well. But I also believe that the reason the American people are a little reluctant for tax cuts at this point is that they are a little worried that somehow tax cuts would erode the solvency and strength of Social Security or not provide for Medicare. As I have shown my colleagues tonight, we cannot only have very, very significant tax cuts, well over several hundred billions in tax cuts; but we can also preserve and protect Social Security, and we can strengthen Medicare and add a prescription drug benefit and even pay down the \$1 trillion of the public debt.

I know what my colleagues are thinking. The only thing missing is a chicken in every pot. Well, I am going to get to that chicken in every pot, because there are a couple of other things that this budget does. We are going to work to restore the American military. I do not like to say this, because I am not particularly keen on a partisan comment, and it is not meant in a partisan way, but I think President Clinton has not been able to pick and choose where we should be involved as a Nation around the world. Too often he has used his heart and not his head, and we have so many entanglements around the world that it is not only eroding the fundamental fiber of our defense structure, but I think over time will diminish our ability to be effective no matter where we are.

At this point in time, we believe we have to put more money into defense. We also believe that over time, with an opportunity for a new President, that maybe we will be in a position of where we can begin to define our national interests more effectively, to be able to husband our resources, to be able to act out of the best self-interests of the United States. In the meantime, we are going to put more money in defense. It is the most important job of the Federal Government.

In addition to that, we are going to strengthen the programs for education, focusing primarily new dollars on special education, a mandate from the Federal Government; and we want to cover more of that mandate. We ultimately want to pay for all of that mandate on special education, but we believe that additional dollars for education ought to go to the classroom. There ought to be maximum flexibility for schools to be able to provide for the most effective education for young people. We also strengthen basic science programs in 2001.

Basic science research and the National Institutes of Health are gems. They are gems in this world as it reflects the operation of government. The National Institutes of Health have been increased significantly since the Republicans have had a majority in the United States Congress. The amount of dollars spent for all of our major diseases, from Alzheimer's to cancer to AIDS to heart research, has all been

dramatically increased, as it should be, because the Federal Government can provide a significant boost and a significant leverage. Coupled with our universities and our hospitals, we know what the potential is for discoveries that can ease the anxiety and salve the wounds of people who experience these diseases. We think it is proper.

Mr. Speaker, concerning basic science research, I know we think sometimes that there are politicians that invented the Internet, but frankly the Internet was invented through the activities of the Department of Defense; and the fact is, basic science research is very important to our ultimate ability to develop meaningful science projects that also improve our lives. That is not picking and choosing winners or losers, it is really saying that there is some basic fundamental research that can be done by the Government that can be applicable by the private sector. We think that strengthening education, strengthening the National Institutes of Health, strengthening science and, I hope in the process, providing full funding for residents and interns in our Children's Hospitals can be accomplished in this budget; that we can work to restore America's defense, that we will, in fact, have tax fairness and tax reform for families and small business and senior citizens, and just everyday people who go to work and that we can pay down a trillion dollars in the publicly held debt so that Karen and my little girls, Emma and Reese, will have a little less burden on their backs.

□ 2030

By the way, they are only a little bit over 8 weeks old, and I get the sense they worry about it once in a while. We work to preserve and strengthen Medicare and provide, we hope at the end of the day, a prescription drug benefit, and we will keep our hands off of Social Security.

I think this is an outstanding blueprint for where we ought to head with the very first budget of the new millennium. I look forward to this House being able to debate and ultimately pass what I think is something that Members of the Congress can feel good about, that we can be good stewards about.

Is there too much spending? Without any question. I would like to have a little less. I would like to have a lot less, actually. But I think that, all in all, with the struggle that we have between conservatives and liberals, people who want to be tight fist and those who want to be big spenders in a very small House that is separated by very few numbers, I think we have put together a program here that can work, that can pass, and that can be a real benefit to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), from the Committee on Budget who I have served with for about a dozen years on that committee.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding to me.

As the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) was talking, I could not help but remember the first time he put forward a comprehensive amendment to get our country's financial house in order in 1989. There were about 38 Members who joined him. But each year, more and more Members were persuaded that, not only were his ideas good but that ultimately he was going to succeed. So my colleagues can imagine the joy I felt in 1995 to see the gentleman from Ohio become the chairman of the Committee on Budget.

Then to have people like the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), who is here with us, a new Member, to start that effort that resulted in our controlling the growth of spending, slowing the growth of entitlements, and being able to move forward with tax cuts.

I was thinking when the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) went through this list, preserving and protecting the Social Security, and preserving and strengthening Medicare with prescription drugs, and retiring the public debt by the year 2013, and promoting tax fairness for families, farmers and seniors, and restoring America's defenses, and strengthening support for education, science and health care, I was thinking we could not do that if it were not for the fact that we put forward a balanced budget agreement.

In the year 1998, literally 30 years after the last time, we had more money coming into the Federal Government than going out; and then 1999, more money coming in than going out; in the year 2000, more money coming in than going out.

Then last year is the first time since 1960 that we, in fact, are not spending the Social Security Trust Fund. We did not spend any of the Social Security Trust Fund last year, and we are not going to spend any this year. We are not going to spend any in the budget that we are going to be voting on.

So I am just extraordinarily grateful that the gentleman from Ohio persevered in this effort and that we are seeing the result. Now we are looking at a possibility of \$4 trillion of surplus in the next 10 years. We are debating \$4 trillion. In some cases, it presents a wonderful opportunity, obviously, but a scary one as well because so many Members want to spend it.

Of that \$4 trillion, \$2 trillion of that money, \$2 trillion of that money is Social Security reserves; and the fact is that \$2 trillion is protected. We are not going to spend Social Security reserves.

We are going to take that \$2 trillion in the next 10 years, and we are going to set it aside and pay down debt. Public debt is going to be reduced by \$2 trillion. It is not going to grow at the rate it was growing. We are cutting down \$2 trillion in public debt, but not spending Social Security reserves on more programs.

But it leaves, of that \$4 trillion, we still have \$2 trillion left. The President wants to spend \$1.3 trillion of it, kind of an automatic pilot, we just let all the budget keep going up, not making choices, just let them all go up.

What we want to do is we want to pay down more debt. We want a sensible tax cut in the next 5 years. We are going to see \$200 billion set aside for tax cuts. We started that process already. We started that process with deciding that we simply could not justify that one could live together as a couple, not be married, but the moment one becomes married, one paid \$1,400 more in taxes.

So instead of having a tax cut that included a lot of items, we are isolating those particular issues, and this is an issue of fairness. We have set aside a tax cut opportunity of \$200 billion in the next 5 years, and some of that will help us eliminate the marriage penalty tax, which passed the House overwhelmingly with even support on both sides of the aisle.

Then we dealt with the issue of the incredible circumstance that, if one is on Social Security and one works and one makes more than \$17,000, one actually pays a penalty. If one now makes, say, 3,000 more, for every \$3 more above \$17,000, one loses \$1 in Social Security. So if one makes \$20,000 trying to make ends meet and not have one's children support one or the government, one is paying taxes on that money. But, in addition, if one made \$20,000, one would be losing Social Security. If one made \$23,000, one would lose \$2,000 in Social Security. We passed a bill that eliminates that penalty because we want our seniors to work. We have a need to have people out in the workforce. We want them to be a happy and vibrant part of the community and not punished if they work.

So we are going to pay down more debt with the \$2 trillion that is not Social Security money, and we are going to have tax cuts. Then we will have some necessary spending.

The gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) pointed out defense is the primary responsibility of the Federal Government. We are not going to ignore that. But he is also pointing out we are going to take a harder look at how we save money and spend it better in defense.

We are going to have some educational need, not Federal educational. We are not federalizing education. We are going to provide assistance to communities and the States to do a better job in education with local decision making. We are going to deal more with health care and sciences.

So it is an exciting time for us in Congress. Really, what we want on Thursday are for common sense Members of Congress to vote for this budget agreement, this budget resolution. It should include Republicans and Democrats.

There is no reason why common sense Members on both sides of the



aisle would not want to preserve and protect the Social Security surplus, would not want to preserve and strengthen Medicare with prescription drugs, would not want to retire the public debt by the year 2013, would not want to promote tax fairness for families, farmers, and seniors, and businessmen in general, and would not want to restore America's defenses, and would not want to strengthen support for education and science.

I just would conclude this part by saying that we saw this difference when a whole number of new Members came in. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is a prime example of that and said we are not going to continue what happened in the past. They have made all the difference.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker's announced policy, the balance of the hour reserved for the majority leader has been reallocated to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for yielding to me.

As the gentleman from Connecticut was speaking, I remember the first time that I spoke on the House floor in January of 1995. We were standing at these tables, and we had the very first bill in the Contract with America, the Shays Act. The gentleman from Connecticut humbly does not like to call it the Shays Act, but I remember what things were like when I came here.

The first thing we did is we said Congress is going to have to live by the same laws as everybody else, now back in Minnesota, and I am certain even in Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota did not have to say "even." Especially in Connecticut.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, especially Connecticut, all over the country, outside of the Beltway, that made perfect sense. But here in Washington, that was a revolutionary idea because Congress for many years had exempted itself. They put a line at the end of many of the bills that nothing in this statute will apply to the Congress and, in many cases, sometimes even the entire Federal Government.

So I was thinking about what things were like when I came here in November of 1994 after that election and then as we were sworn in in January of 1995 and how much different things are today. I think to the average Member of Congress, and certainly to the average American, it is easy to forget where we were then and where we were going then.

I remember that, shortly after we came, the Congressional Budget Office gave us a study and a report. They said, if Congress does not get serious about balancing this Federal budget, that by the time children being born

today reach middle age, and I hate to say it, I am getting painfully close to that, where some people might call me middle age, but by the time the children today grow to middle age, the Congressional Budget Office told us that they will be paying a Federal income tax of over 80 percent just to pay the interest on the national debt. That was worse than disgraceful. I mean, there was something fundamentally immoral about this idea that we could continue to borrow and, in effect, tax the next generation.

Many of us said in the original election in 1994, we had one priority. It was to balance the Federal budget, to put the Federal budget in order, and leave our kids with a legacy and a future that would not be saddled with enormous Federal taxes just to pay the debt. That is where we were in 1995.

We laid out a plan. Thanks to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and so many other courageous leaders in the Congress at that time, many people, and again we tend to forget a lot of people said, well, it cannot be done. You cannot balance the budget in 7 years.

In fact, sometimes even some people down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue were out there saying, well, no one really believes you are going to balance the budget. But the interesting thing about the power of a thought, of an idea, of a belief is that, is how quickly it begins to take root, and other people start to come along.

There was a small band originally. It started back with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) many years ago with this idea that, yes, we can balance the budget; yes, we can apply fiscal restraint to Federal spending.

I was also reminded, though, the other day, and my kids are all grown, but the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) was talking about his youngsters, and I remember reading to my kids when they were smaller. One of their favorite stories, one of my favorite stories was a story of the Little Red Hen. I just want to repeat just how that story works, because I think it is apropos for what we are doing today.

First of all, the Little Red Hen asked all the other animals in the barn yard, who will help me grow the wheat? The dog said, I cannot. The cat said, I will not. The cow said, I cannot. The pig said, I will not. So she went ahead and grew the wheat herself.

Then she asked, when the wheat was grown, who will help me grind the wheat? Of course the cat said, I will not. The dog said, I will not. The cow said, I will not. The pig said, I will not.

Then it was time to bake the bread. She asked, who would help her bake the bread. Same thing. All the other animals said either they could not or they would not.

But it was interesting, once they finally had the bread, once the Little

Red Hen had the bread, then they all wanted to help eat the bread.

Do my colleagues remember that story? I was thinking about that story the other day.

Now, we are going to hear a lot of debate when this resolution hits the floor about what are we going to do with the budget surplus. A lot of the same people who were not very eager to help us create the budget surplus, in fact, I was thinking, parenthetically, about all those negative ads we saw particularly in 1996 about these draconian cuts to Medicare, and we were going to no longer have any student loans, and school lunches will be a thing of the past, and children will grow hungry, and old people will be thrown out in the street. What we really did, we did eliminate 600 Federal programs. That was an amazing accomplishment in and of itself. But some of the biggest complaints were that we actually slowed the rate of growth of Federal spending.

I want to just share this with other Members of the House and anyone else who may be listening, because I think this is really an amazing accomplishment. In the budget, we are proposing for next fiscal year the rate of increase in Federal spending will slow to 2.2 percent. Let me put that in real numbers. Last year or the fiscal year we are in right now, we are spending \$1,780 billion dollars. Now, that is a lot of money. What we are proposing to spend next year, total, is \$1,820 billion dollars. That works out to a 2.2 percent increase in total Federal spending.

Now, put that in context to where we were a few years ago when the Federal budget was growing up at a rate of 6, 8, 10, 12 percent per year. It was not that many years ago when Federal spending was going up double, triple, and even quadruple the rate of inflation.

Today to take that 2.2 increase in Federal spending in next year and put it in real context, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the average family budget this year will increase at 4.9 percent.

So as the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) was talking about, in terms of historical terms, next year, the Federal budget will grow at less than half the rate of the average family budget. What is the real benefit of that? Well, the biggest benefit, and my colleagues have talked about it, is that over the next 5 years we are going to pay down a trillion dollars' worth of debt held by the public.

□ 2045

And what does that mean? It means lower interest rates.

Now, Chairman Greenspan my continue to sort of tweak the interest rates a little to slow the economy, but the beauty is that interest rates are much lower than they would have been. And as we go forward, there is no driving force coming from the Federal Government because we are going to the treasury markets and borrowing an extra trillion or \$2 or \$3 trillion. And as

long as that happens, real interest rates will be lower. And that means that more families can afford homes, more families can afford cars, more families can afford refrigerators, and it means that we are going to have a stronger economy, relatively speaking, than we would have had.

Finally, let me say, at the end of the day, when we talk about the budget, and I know people's eyes start to glaze over when we talk about the budget, because we talk in terms of billions and percentages and it is numbers and it is all of that, but at the end of the day what it really is all about is generational fairness. In fact, coming from the Midwest, where most of my relatives were farmers and most of my friends and neighbors are no more than one or two generations removed from the farm, it has almost been historic.

Everybody coming from a farm area understands this. This was really part and parcel of the American Dream. It was the American Dream to one day pay off the mortgage and leave the kids the farm. What we had been doing, or what previous Congresses had been doing is selling the farm and leaving the kids with the mortgage. That was just fundamentally immoral, and it really flew in the face of generational fairness.

The great thing about this budget is that it guarantees that we are going to take care of my parents, who are both on Social Security and Medicare. We are going to make certain they can have the quality of life they are entitled to. And it is also going to be fair to people our age, people who are working, people who have kids in college. Because we are going to let them keep a little more of their money. And particularly in couples where there are husbands and wives both working. But, finally, by beginning to pay down some of that debt, we are going to leave our kids a much brighter economic future.

So this is not about dollars and cents as much as it is about people, as much as it is about fundamental fairness and, I might even say, fundamental morality. So I congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for all that they have done over the last several years to dramatically slow the rate of growth in spending, because it is going to mean a brighter future for all Americans.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I would just say that this has been a wonderful team effort. We had new players come on the scene and they have made all the difference. Now, I cannot call the gentleman from Minnesota a new player, because the gentleman is in his 6th year. But just think, 6 years ago we saw massive deficits as far as the eye could see and now we are seeing significant surpluses, and our challenge now is to convince our colleagues not to spend all the surplus and make government bigger.

It is not to say we are not spending more money, we are simply targeting

it. We are going to spend \$2.2 billion more in elementary and secondary education, a phenomenal increase. We are going to be spending \$6 billion more for farmers, who truly need it. And even someone like myself, coming from an area where we do not have a lot of farmers in the traditional sense, we have some dairy farmers, but we know that is necessary not just for them but for us.

As my colleague was talking about selling the farm, I was thinking that we are also going right after that death tax. And the most compelling reason for our leaving \$200 billion for tax cuts over the next 5 years is to go squarely at the death tax that forces people to sell their businesses in Bridgeport, Connecticut, or in Norwalk or Stamford, Connecticut, when their parents die, to pay the inheritance tax. The businesses then, in a lot of cases, disappear. And it was a viable business. They cannot keep it because they have to pay a 55 percent inheritance tax. Now, we did increase the exemption to \$1 million for farmers and businesses, but most businesses are far in excess of that.

I was at a community meeting just recently and I had someone, after I talked about it, come up with a real life example. He literally had a property that his parents had that he was still living in with his two other siblings. It was sold for \$3 million. A lot of money. And his parents had equity in the market of about another million. So they had \$4 million. And he said by the time they paid the inheritance tax and the lawyers, and the probate court got done, he and his two siblings will get \$400,000 each. They will get 30 percent of the total value of their property. It was property that was earned; it was property where taxes were paid. They owned this property, and basically the government took over 55 percent of that.

So it just tells me that when we talk in kind of a theoretical way about taxes, we have to be mindful that we are really talking about that young individual, and we are talking about what his parents were able to leave and keep in the family. They had to sell the house and they will get a minimal amount. They will get 30 percent out of the total of the value of their property.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If the gentleman will continue to yield, it is, again, the story of the little red hen. Here we have people who did not help bake that bread who are saying, well, we are entitled to over half of the loaf of bread. And again this is not just about tax policy, it is about fundamental morality.

Clearly, we need tax revenue. We have legitimate things that are needed as a society, whether it is the common national defense, for highways, lots of other needed projects, but any time we see a tax rate that gets above 50 percent, and the gentleman is absolutely correct, very quickly the estate tax gets to 55 percent, that is confiscatory.

That is wrong. That is part of the reason people started shooting up at Lexington and Concord. And Americans still have that basic feeling about fairness, and it really transcends things.

Mr. SHAYS. And if we are talking about the concept of fairness, why should a married couple pay more than a couple that is not married in taxes? Why should someone who has earned Social Security and if they go back to working and paying taxes pay an additional penalty due to the Social Security earnings limitation? For every \$3 above that \$17,000, \$1 is taken out of Social Security. That was a matter of fairness. And the third tax cut that we move forward with, why should a corporation be able to deduct health care and a private individual working, self-employed individual, not have that same deduction? In fact, the tax cut that the President vetoed just 2 years ago allowed all Americans to deduct for health care.

So I am just struck by the fact that we have made tremendous progress, we are talking about fairness in taxes, but we are also talking about something else. We are talking about what taxes will help the economy grow.

In 1990, I voted for a tax increase. The one tax increase I voted for, and I learned a big lesson. I voted to increase the luxury tax. And it was interesting, I voted to increase the luxury tax and the government got less money. They got less money because people, who can all make rational decisions, they decided that if the tax was higher, they would buy less, and we got less revenue. Conversely, when we dealt with capital gains, we cut taxes and we got so much more revenue.

So what two better examples. We can raise some taxes and get less revenue; we can cut some taxes and get more, and we can have the economic engine, that balanced budget agreement of 1997, which has made a world of difference. It has balanced our budget. We are in surpluses. We are no longer spending Social Security. We are able to cut taxes, and we are seeing the economy grow and grow.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If the gentleman will continue to yield, and going back to the luxury tax, I remember the argument at the time that somehow this would punish people who had made lots of money who were buying expensive boats. Well, it did not punish them at all. It punished the poor people working in the boat yards that built the boats.

Mr. SHAYS. Well, this hits home pretty hard, because they were not poor people. They were middle-income and upper-middle income people who were making boats, having great jobs. It was one of the true indigenous industries in the United States; where we did not have many exports. We were making the product and selling it in the United States. And it, unfortunately, did a lot of damage. A lot of companies went out of business.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. The other analogy about the boats is the story President

KENNEDY used, that a rising tide lifts all boats. And if we have some fiscal responsibility, as we have seen in the last 5 years, that by properly managing the budget and by controlling the growth in Federal spending and by allowing families and investors to keep more of what they earned, we have had a much stronger economy. And we have been able to lift a lot of boats out there. And it is not just the people making a million dollars a year, it is an awful lot of those people making \$30,000 and \$35,000 and \$40,000 a year. I see our chairman is back.

Mr. KASICH. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I just wanted to make the point by saying we are going to pay down a trillion dollars in the publicly-held debt. That is a breathtaking number.

Mr. SHAYS. In the next 5 years.

Mr. KASICH. Over the next 5 years. A trillion dollars in paying down part of this publicly-held debt. Secondly, though, we have got this tax relief, and it does not threaten Medicare or Social Security. Social Security is protected in this bill. Medicare is not only protected but it can be enhanced with the prescription drug program.

So I think what every American ought to know, when somebody says we want to have a tax cut and some politician says, oh no, it is going to threaten Social Security and Medicare, that that simply is not true. We provide for the strengthening of Social Security and Medicare right up front. And once we have done that, we then feel that we should have tax relief.

And we also provide in this budget that if we pass this tax relief but it does not get signed by the President, that that tax relief, that money does not get used for more spending. That money does not get used for more spending. That money goes to pay down additional debt.

So I think what every American ought to know is to be able to have this kind of a proposal before us this week is something that I think they ought to think about. Do not get caught by a car salesman, a used car—no, I do not want to say that. I was going to say used car salesman. I know more good used car salesmen. Let me say this, do not get trapped by some smooth talking person moving peas under a shell who says we cannot have tax relief because the politicians want to spend it, because they want to spend it, and that we are going to hurt Social Security. We protect Social Security, protect Medicare, pay down debt and have tax relief for all Americans.

I think it is a pretty significant accomplishment. I appreciate the gentlemen taking the time and presenting their arguments. They were outstanding.

#### A COMMEMORATION OF FAITH AND POLITICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker's an-

nounced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to commemorate and to recall an extraordinary weekend that I and many of my colleagues had the opportunity to spend with our colleague, one of the historic Members of this House. He is probably, I suppose, the most historic Member of this House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

The event that we participated in just a couple of weeks ago was under the aegis of the Faith & Politics Institute, headed up by the Reverend Doug Tanner. Reverend Tanner delivered the prayer, Mr. Speaker, at the opening of this session of the House, and he is here with us on the floor. It was an extraordinary opportunity for many of us to relive with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and with others the courage and commitment shown by some Americans so that all Americans would have the right to avail themselves fully of their constitutionally guaranteed right to vote.

We went to Birmingham, Alabama, then to Montgomery, then to Selma, and back to Montgomery. Montgomery, Alabama, is, of course, the capital of Alabama. Birmingham, as I will say briefly, was the site of a confrontation between freedom and evil, between those who would deny other human beings basic rights because of the color of their skin. We see in today's world across the globe that happening too often, where nationalism and racism and other ethnic divisions drive people to commit heinous acts against others.

It is appropriate that we remember what has happened in the past so that we can hopefully avoid it happening in the future and sensitize ourselves to the pain of others when they are inadvertently shut out, even if we are not consciously setting them aside and denying their rights.

□ 2100

Mr. Speaker, as we stand at the dawn of a new century and join the strongest economy in 50 years, we sometimes overlook what brought us to this point. Two weeks ago, as I said, we were again reminded, reminded that the book of American history includes chapters that are both repugnant and, thankfully, triumphant.

We were reminded that the courage to confront injustice and inhumanity is an indelible part of our national character. And we were reminded, Mr. Speaker, in the words of abolitionist and journalist Frederick Douglass, if there is no struggle, there is no progress.

On Sunday, March 5, we witnessed dramatically this progress, and we honored the courageous and continuing struggle for social justice. Two Sundays ago, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), who is here with me on the floor, cochaired with the

gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) this effort and the congressional participation in the Institute on Faith and Politics.

We were joined by nearly 20 other Members of Congress, by President Clinton, leaders of the civil rights movement and thousands of others in Selma, Alabama, to commemorate a seminal moment in American history, Bloody Sunday. That phrase entered the American lexicon on March 7, 1965, 35 years ago, when Alabama state troopers and the posse of sheriffs, so-called deputies, attacked 600 men, women and children who had marched peacefully across the Edmond Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama.

Those brave marchers who were led by our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), and Reverend Josiah William had committed no crime or offense. In short, there was no reason that they would be attacked by those who were sworn to uphold the law, protect the citizens of Alabama, and honor the Constitution of this great Nation.

Those marchers had simply demanded the most basic of American rights, the most basic right in any democracy, the right of a citizen to express their opinion to participate in the decision-making process of their Nation, by voting. In Selma, in 1965 less than 1 percent of eligible black residents were registered to vote. Not, Mr. Speaker, because they did not desire to vote, not because they did not think that voting was important, but because they were being precluded by various devices. Literacy tests, poll taxes, intimidation were the weapons used to disenfranchise and discourage those from participating in their democracy.

The marchers sought to change that, but their rightful demand was met with nightsticks, bullwhips, tear gas, ignorance, and hatred. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) who has now joined us on the floor, was one of the first to fall, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman led this march through the courage of his convictions, not just for African Americans, but for all Americans, knowing full well that if justice was not accorded to African Americans, it would not be accorded to any American ultimately.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) when ordered to do so by the state troopers stopped in his place as he crossed the Edmond Pettus Bridge. They told him to retreat. Rather than retreat, however, he bowed his head and began to pray; and the response of the Alabama state troopers on that March 7, 1965, was to assault the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and those with whom he marched.

They fractured his skull with a nightstick, injuring him seriously. That event was a dramatic historic event in the history of this country. A few days later, President Lyndon Johnson put these horrific events into context, declaring to a joint session of

Congress, and I quote, "At times, history and fate meet at a single time in a single place to shape a turning point in man's unending search for freedom." "So it was," he said, "at Lexington and Concord, so it was a century ago at Appomattox, and so it was," Lyndon Johnson concluded, "last week in Selma, Alabama."

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I want to especially thank the Faith and Politics Institute for organizing this recent pilgrimage to Alabama and for allowing me and so many of my colleagues to attend. As we walked by the statues of snarling dogs in Birmingham's Kelly Ingram Park and toured the 16th Street Baptist Church where four little innocent unknown beautiful girls who happened to be black died in a murderous explosion in 1963.

I was struck, Mr. Speaker, again, by the depth of the gentleman from Georgia's (Mr. LEWIS) courage and commitment to justice for all and how that same courage and commitment was shared by so many men, women, and children that we will never know.

Mr. Speaker, we rise to commemorate their courage tonight and their perseverance too; for on this night, March 21, 1965, began the Selma to Montgomery march that successfully concluded on the steps of the Alabama State Capitol 4 days later.

The marchers who were brutalized on Bloody Sunday and the marchers who made it to Montgomery 2 weeks later reminded us that nightsticks are no match for reason; that bullwhips stand no chance against courage; and that ignorance and hatred have no place in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

A little more than a year later, a year after Bloody Sunday, Robert Kennedy summed it far more eloquently than I can hope to do; and I repeated those words as we met at the end of that incredible weekend. He was speaking in Capetown, South Africa, to a group of African students; and he said this, that "each time a man stands up for an ideal or acts to improve the lot of others or speaks out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope and crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring, they build a tide that can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance."

There were 600 people who left the AME Church, the Brown AME Church in Selma, walked the few blocks to the Edmund Pettus Bridge, who were standing up for an ideal, were speaking out against injustice, were acting to improve the lot of others. And as the attack on them appeared on television that night, they, through their courage and commitment, built a tide that did, in fact, sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance.

What a debt of gratitude, Mr. Speaker, this Nation owes to those brave souls.

So it was in Selma in 1965. And what 1965 tells to us most clearly is that it is

that way today. We have made much progress. But all of us know there is a far way to go.

There is a great song, Mr. Speaker, that ends with this refrain in the first verse, "Facing the rising sun of our new day begun, let us march on til victory is won."

History tells us that full victory is never won. There are victories in battles. But, unfortunately, man's inclination to discriminate against his fellow man always seems to crop its head above the surface.

And so, I say to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), he teaches us a lesson and all those with whom he marched; he honored us by allowing us to help commemorate that day with him and others who marched on that day. Let us all pray that, when the next time comes, we too will have the courage that he displayed to stand up, to speak out, to act against oppression, to, with him, knock down those mighty walls of oppression and resistance.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), as I said, a historic figure who has contributed beyond perhaps all of us collectively to the realization of what this great democracy means not just to the American people but to the peoples of this world.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and my colleague, who is really my friend and my brother, for yielding and for hosting this special order tonight, along with my friend, my colleague, and my brother, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for those wonderful words and for being part of this journey, this dialogue, this trip, this privilege to Alabama.

In my position here in the Congress, but as an individual, as co-chair of an organization, Faith and Politics, with my good friend and brother the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), this was our third trip to Alabama. We felt it was necessary for us to travel as Members of Congress with our spouses, with our staff members, and with our friends to go, to see, to feel, to travel the roads where other travelers 35 years ago and more to go back to Birmingham, as my colleague stated, to visit the church, to visit the park where the dogs and the fire hoses were used, to visit the city of Montgomery, visit Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s church, to visit the memorial to the civil rights martyrs, to travel to Selma and to visit the Brown Chapel AME Church, to walk across that bridge across the Alabama River one more time.

I think it was not just a trip, but it was an opportunity for us to bond, to become brothers and sisters, to become, yes, a band of brothers and sisters to engage in a meaningful discussion, a meaningful dialogue about race.

Because I think what the struggle was all about 35 years ago, and still

today under the leadership of Doug Tanner and the good people of Faith and Politics, to bring us together to that point where we can lay down the burden of race and build a truly beloved community, to build a truly interracial democracy in America, where committee can forget about race and color and see people as people, as human beings.

I think that is what is so meaningful about a group of us coming together not as Democrats, not as Republicans, but as Americans, as men and women, who believe somehow and some way that we can find a way to create a sense of community, to create one house, one family, the American house, the American community.

So I am so thankful and grateful tonight to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for taking the time out to have this special order to share with our colleagues and share with our friends this journey to Alabama, this journey of reconciliation, this journey on understanding.

□ 2115

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for giving us all that opportunity and for his comments which are as compelling tonight as he always is, because they are real, heartfelt, and live sentiments. I thank my colleague. We are all honored to be his friend. I now want to yield to another extraordinary American. In the context of cochair of the Faith & Politics Institute, an American who comes from an extraordinarily different background from the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), who superficially people would say is much different than the gentleman from Georgia but they look on the outward manifestation of the color of skin which is just a superficial difference because he is, as the gentleman from Georgia referred to him, very much a brother, very much someone whose heart and head tells him that we are all in this together and we need to respect one another and lift one another up. We are all honored to serve with him in the Congress of the United States, my friend the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON).

Mr. HOUGHTON. I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), I thank the Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and thank so many of my associates here. I want to particularly thank the gentleman from Maryland for putting this together. It is the right and it is the decent thing to do. It is timely. And frankly what we are trying to do is to encourage others to be more involved in this enormous experience which we had down in Selma. As a matter of fact, we have had for several years now. The person, of course, that has driven it is a fellow called Doug Tanner who is the head of the Faith & Politics Institute.

The gentleman from Georgia and I originally said that we would join the Faith & Politics Institute so long as we

had no work to do because we were busy enough as it is, and all of a sudden we find ourselves doing more and more and more and more for Mr. Tanner, this Christlike figure who stands up there and feels, well, it is only because you want to do it, that is what is happening. I think the gentleman from Georgia would agree, we are doing far more than we originally bought into, but it has been enormously satisfying.

I think one of the things that struck me in this extraordinary experience in going to Selma and going there with the gentleman from Georgia was just the gentleman from Georgia himself. I know this is embarrassing for the gentleman from Georgia to hear all this, but it is true. Martin Luther King is no longer with us. It is tragic. Here was a man who was born 3 years after I was born and has been dead over 30 years.

But the younger members of that group, the SNCC, the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee were there and when you see not only our friend the gentleman from Georgia who is an associate of ours and works here and legislates with us and has been with us all along, and then to associate with Betty Fykes and Bernard Lafayette and Jose Williams and people like that, they are all alive, and they were the people that drove this whole thing, the younger people. I think one of the things that comes along is that the younger people really are the ones that say damn the torpedoes and go ahead and do the things which are right and the others are a little more conservative. As a result, we owe the gentleman from Georgia not only as our friend but also this enormous leader a tremendous debt of gratitude.

I hope those people who are listening will recognize this; I think we all do around here. I will always remember when John came to Corning, we had a continuation of the days of dialogue in upstate New York, in the district in which I live. It was extraordinary to see him at work there, because all of a sudden people said, here is the man that did all this, here is the man that led it. We had not realized what he stood for and what he was doing, what he represented. And then, of course, he had this wonderful associate, Sheila Sisulu, who is the South African ambassador here. Sheila Sisulu as many Members I am sure realize is the daughter-in-law of Walter Sisulu who was one of the two other partners of Nelson Mandela and stayed in South Africa and went to Robben Island, was there with him for over 20 years while Oliver Tambo went to Lesotho to keep the African National Congress going. She is the daughter-in-law.

But there was the gentleman from Georgia talking about the oppression that he was fighting, that he was literally willing to lay down his life for. I am sure there were times that he never thought that he would live another day. And here was Sheila Sisulu talking about the institutionalized apartheid in South Africa, what they had

gone through. It made me realize how lucky we are to be Americans and to live in this particular time. It was just extraordinary.

There were other things that came along. Just the singing, the music. I know the singing of Betty Fykes and what it did to you in 1965 but what it did to us. Here we were just standing there and all of a sudden this lovely lady burst out into song. It cheered our spirits and made us feel better about things. And then, of course, I take nothing away from the gentleman from Maryland's eloquence and he is a very eloquent man but I will never forget being in Brown Chapel following the pastor of Brown Chapel and the gentleman from Georgia and then me, this former glassblower from upstate New York trying to make some sense out of the message. It was an awe-inspiring feeling.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield, he notices I chose to speak before the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HOUGHTON. If the gentleman will notice, he placed me after the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HOYER. I apologize for that. That was an unfair thing to do.

Mr. HOUGHTON. When you hear those words and the emotions behind them, it does something to you. That is why this extraordinary experience is so important to be shared with everybody. This was an unusual year. It was the 35th anniversary of that march. It was unusual for another reason, because the President of the United States came down there. When the President of the United States comes down, it just changes the whole nature of it. But the crowds that were there and how they related to the words and the younger people that spoke. It was just a really extraordinary experience. It did something to me.

Again as I mentioned earlier, I would love to be able to share that with others. There is one downside, if I could just mention very briefly, is that while we celebrated the 35th anniversary of this extraordinary experience and honored those people who had led us, the fact is that there is still tremendous racial tension. You could see it even in the school system in that area where most of the people in the old days used to be in the high schools, the official high schools were white. Now most of the people in the high schools are black. But where do the white people go? Many times they have gone into private education. They have not integrated the way I know that the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Maryland and others had hoped they would, and how we had hoped they would.

So the people that would say that Affirmative Action is wrong and we can go on automatic pilot and this thing is a thing of the past, there are no more Bull Connors, there is something very subtle going on here. It will not be erased for years and generations and generations to come. That is the thing

that we have got to work on. It is not only what we do but really who we are.

I will always remember a wonderful story about Archibald MacLeish giving a lecture. He was most of the way through, a student raised his hand and said, Mr. MacLeish, you have only got about 5 minutes to go, could you sort of sum up what you have to say? He said, yes, I will, I would sum it up like this. Don't forget the thing and the student said what do you mean by the thing? Mr. MacLeish says, the thing is what you are is just as important as what you do. That is why we so applaud and honor the gentleman from Georgia and all his associates. I thank the gentleman from Maryland again for allowing me to speak.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from New York for the depth of his integrity and the quality of his leadership in this House.

I want to yield to my very good friend, someone for whom I have a great deal of respect and affection, who has spent his time as a Member, he has been with this institution for a long period of time. I guess he is now in his third decade of work in this institution but a relatively new Member, succeeding his mentor and a great Member of this body, Bob Michel, but who has done as much as any Member in this body to try to bring us together collegially irrespective of party or faction or ideology, and that is a service that this institution needs. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for this hour that has been set aside by the gentleman from Maryland to sort of commemorate and share a little bit about the trip that some of us took, much of which has been talked about already in such great detail as the gentleman from Maryland has done and then the gentleman from Georgia and also the gentleman from New York.

I want to add my thanks to Doug Tanner for the work that he does with the Faith & Politics, to the gentleman from Maryland for this hour and really to say that normally these hours are set aside by Members to talk about issues that are near and dear to their heart and in particular in some cases that they feel very strongly about, and so for us to take this hour and talk about an opportunity that all of us had to share an experience in Selma, Alabama, to share the experience in Birmingham, to share the experience in Montgomery, to share the experience of walking across the Edmund Pettus Bridge is an opportunity for us to say to the American people that we do come here to make laws, to pass bills, but we also come here from districts where we return to demonstrate leadership, and not always in the bills that we pass but more on the other things that we do.

Part of what some of us have done was to travel to the Deep South and to

observe in a very surreal fashion because we were there with the gentleman from Georgia and many of his friends and compatriots and colleagues that were there 35 years ago. And this opportunity was offered to many but only a few of us went. And so for some of us to be able to experience, the second year for me, I went last year, my wife and I went again this year, it was different. It was different this year because of the huge mass of people that were there, in large part I think because the President was there which again highlights the importance of the event and highlights the importance of what took place and highlights the importance of dialogue and race relations and faith and politics coming together.

But it is important for us I think to go back to our districts and to share with our constituents and to meet with leaders in our districts and talk to them about the importance of dialogue, about the importance of race relations, about some things that have happened that we call progress but also talk about many things that we need to do to make further progress. I certainly intend to do that. I am hoping to invite the gentleman from Georgia to my hometown of Peoria, Illinois, to have him have a dialogue and to help conduct a dialogue and to be a part of a group of leaders in my community that can talk about race relations and the progress we have made but the long drive that we have ahead of us.

Finally, let me say that we have 435 in this House. Each one brings a little different background, a little different dimension, a little different experience, but there is only one among us who has the kind of background and influence and standing in the civil rights movement, in the voting rights movement, in the race relations movement, in the faith and politics movement and that is the gentleman from Georgia. He is one unto his own when it comes to voting rights, race relations, civil rights, because of what he has done, because of what he has experienced and that he did not come here forgetting it, he came here to say to people, follow me, let me show you what we have been through and what we need to do in the future.

So for the 434 of us who know the gentleman from Georgia and for the few of us who know him as a friend, as a brother, as somebody who is a leader, a power of one, I think if we do not take anything else away from our experience in the House, it will be the fact that we were a part of the experience of the gentleman from Georgia, and hopefully we will be a part of an experience of doing more and carrying on what the gentleman from Georgia has really begun earlier on in his life.

□ 2130

JOHN, thank you for being a part of this wonderful institution and doing more than just coming here and passing bills and giving speeches but setting an example and saying to us, come

with me and share my experience and then go back into your communities and provide the leadership. Without your leadership, without what you have done, we would not be doing what we are doing, and so we are grateful to you for being more than just a Congressman from Atlanta, Georgia, but for being a leader and continuing to be a leader.

So I say thank you to you, and we look forward to continuing to work with you hand in hand, shoulder to shoulder, to improve race relations in this country and we do have much work ahead of us.

I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for devoting this hour to our experience and for articulating so well what we were able to experience in Selma and Birmingham and Montgomery. We look forward to working with all of the Members to carry on what we need to do here and back in our districts.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) for those remarks. We all share his view of JOHN's place in this House.

I yield to my friend from the city of brotherly love. I say that not facetiously. We in Penn wanted that to be a State and City of Brotherly Love, but we know all too often in this Nation where brotherly love is preached and brotherly love gets a doff of the hat from time to time, unfortunately there are too oftentimes when it is not practiced. So I am pleased to recognize someone who went with us and who added immeasurably to our experience, a gentleman from the Philadelphia region and Montgomery County, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

Mr. HOEFFEL. I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for arranging for this hour, giving us a chance to come together this evening to talk about our trip to Alabama.

It was a remarkable experience for all of us who participated in this civil rights pilgrimage to commemorate the 35th anniversary of the voting rights march in Selma. I want to thank the Faith & Politics Institute and Doug Tanner for his leadership and for bringing us together.

It was remarkable to visit the civil rights movement landmarks that I had never seen in person before, to learn more about the history of this country in the 1960s. It was equally remarkable to meet so many of the leaders of the movement and the foot soldiers of that movement, so many of which are still with us today, still providing leadership.

It was particularly remarkable to be there with JOHN LEWIS. Many people tonight have spoken in high praise of JOHN, and I want to do the same. Someone said it was almost surreal being there with JOHN, and it was. For me, the surreal moment was riding in the tour bus I think between Montgomery and Selma, and watching on the television screens in the bus parts of the

documentary, *Eyes on the Prize*, of the civil rights movement, seeing a young JOHN LEWIS being interviewed, speaking back in the 1960s, and then looking down the aisle of the bus and seeing JOHN LEWIS today moving around talking to his colleagues on that bus.

It certainly drove home to me the remarkable passage that this leader has had in the civil rights movement and how special he is to all of us. JOHN embodies virtually every important moment of the civil rights movement in the 1960s. He helped to organize and lead the lunch counter sit-ins in Nashville in 1960. He was one of the 11 original freedom riders in 1961. He helped to organize the March on Washington and spoke eloquently there in 1963 and, of course, led the voting rights march at Selma in 1965, right at the front row.

It was just remarkable to see that footage watching my new friend, JOHN LEWIS, in 1965 be run over by the police forces and beaten because he wanted to march for voting rights, because he had the courage to stand forward and the courage to do it in a nonviolent way; the courage to use passive resistance to reach the heart and soul of the American people and say there has to be a better way; there has to be a better way to have true freedom and equality for all Americans.

So I would say to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), I certainly learned a new appreciation for the hard work and the sacrifices that were made by many leaders and many foot soldiers to win civil and voting rights for all Americans.

I also developed, I believe, a deeper understanding of the work that remains to be done, to make sure that all Americans really have the equal justice and the full opportunities that we want them to have.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), who provided and provides wonderful leadership for the Faith & Politics Institute, already talked about Selma of today compared to Selma of 1965, and it is an interesting comparison. In 1965, legal segregation was the order of the day and the official today, I guess, would be called high schools were all white and the black children went to school in segregated high schools. That was true throughout the Deep South.

Well, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 changed many, many things in this country; but today, in the year 2000, Selma still has a form of segregation. It is de facto now. There is only one set of public high schools. And as the gentleman indicated they are almost all black; and the white students have chosen to go to different schools, religious schools or private schools. So there is a different kind of segregation.

The work that JOHN LEWIS fought so hard for 35 years ago and that we commemorated a couple of weeks ago still has much to be done in the face of that segregation, and I do not mean to pick on Selma or Alabama or the South of

today because that kind of segregation really occurs everywhere; in the North, in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, the suburbs of Philadelphia, which I represent.

The schools are integrated and there is a great racial understanding in the suburban school that my daughter attended and my son currently attends, but there is social segregation. The blacks tend to socialize and congregate and eat lunch together and the whites tend to be together, and there is understanding and there is good relations but there is still that social segregation.

There are subtle forms of segregation in the North, almost as bad perhaps as the legal segregation of old in the South. In the Philadelphia School District, because of a lack of local resources and indifference from our State government, Philadelphia school kids have \$2,000 less per pupil spent on them than suburban school kids do, \$2,000 less in the big Philadelphia School District. That is not strictly a racial result, but there is a subtle form of segregation happening there.

As the President so eloquently said in Selma a couple of weeks ago, when he spoke to us all, that as long as there is de facto segregation in the public schools in Selma we have another bridge to cross; as long as there is \$2,000 less available to educate school children in Philadelphia than school children in the suburbs of Philadelphia, we have another bridge to cross. As long as social injustice and discrimination continues to occur in this country, we all have another bridge to cross. As long as parents work two jobs but cannot bring home a living wage, there is another bridge to cross. As long as families do not have health care, as long as seniors cannot get the prescription drug coverage they need, we have another bridge to cross.

We all agree on that. We differ on some of the ways to get across that bridge, and we have policy disputes down here. And that is why we are here, and that is the beauty of this body. But we have to recognize that as important as it is to remember what happened 35 years ago and to honor amazing Americans like JOHN LEWIS, we have to learn from JOHN and take inspiration from JOHN but be honest with ourselves about the problems that still exist and face those problems forthrightly, face them together and understand that we are all in this together.

If we recognize that and work together, then we will truly honor what happened 35 years ago. If we fail to work together today, then much of what happened in the past will be for naught, and none of us can stand for that result to happen.

So I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for his leadership. I thank JOHN LEWIS and the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) and all of my colleagues who attended, and particularly those speaking here to-

night. I was glad to be a part of it and will continue to work with you.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) for his comments and for his making a comment about the time between what was done in 1965 and that bridge being crossed, and I would comment that when we crossed the bridge in 2000, 35 years later, I think all of us were struck by the fact that there were Alabama troopers on the other side of that bridge but their response, when the end of the Edmund Pettus Bridge was reached by JOHN LEWIS and others, was to salute, to salute in honor of all that JOHN had accomplished and all that JOHN represented, and showed a revolutionary change in those short 35 years.

The governor of Alabama, rather than talking about interposition and other doctrines of States' rights, met JOHN and the President at the bridge and Governor Siegelman welcomed JOHN LEWIS home because, of course, JOHN LEWIS comes from Alabama; moved to Georgia and represents that State very well.

I think the gentleman from Philadelphia (Mr. HOEFFEL), from Montgomery County as opposed to Montgomery, Alabama, made very clear the point that the march of 1965 continues to this date.

Now I would like to recognize my friend who now represents Birmingham and surrounding areas in Alabama, a former member of the State legislature, a State senator who himself was involved in the struggle, who himself was a fighter for freedom. I am pleased to recognize and yield to my friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HILLIARD).

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, first let me say that it was indeed a pleasure having all of my colleagues in the Seventh Congressional District in Alabama. I represent three major cities in Alabama, Birmingham, Montgomery and Selma, and those were the cities where most of the civil rights activities in the Nation took place, and the surrounding areas, of course.

For the last 4 years, we have been going, Members of Congress, to Alabama, participating in what we call a renewal demonstration; one that shows our commitment to the future. It also shows that we are not satisfied with the past, but presently every time we go, every time there are such activities, it highlights the wrongs of the past but it also shows a brightness for the future.

The good thing about our presence there, we bring the spotlight of the Nation to Birmingham, Montgomery and Selma, and problems of the past.

□ 2145

But when we highlight problems of the past, we also show lingering problems that are still with us. This time when I crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge, I said to myself that there are so many bridges in our lives that need to be crossed. We still have in this country the racial divide.

But I would like to associate myself with the remarks of all the prior speakers, but especially the remarks of the last gentleman who spoke. We not only have problems in Selma, Birmingham, and Montgomery, but in this Nation. It is how we approach the problems now as compared to the past that is so interesting, because there is really no comparison.

Even though the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and others were nonviolent in their approach, it was not universal. I would like to think that we are approaching that universality, that we are getting close; that every year more and more people join the cause and more and more people want to do good and more and more people cross the Edmund Pettus Bridge with us. I would like to think that in America things are getting better, and hopefully, with what we will do, they will continue to get better. But I realize in each one of our lives there are still Edmund Pettus Bridges that must be crossed.

So because of our experiences in going to Selma, Montgomery, and Birmingham, and because of our lifetime commitment here in Congress to democracy and to our society, I think that it is good to go and participate yearly, so that we can renew our commitment, not only as individuals but as Members of Congress.

If we could, by our presence continue to spotlight the evils of the past and the goodness of the present, I think we will continue to chip away at those problems that exist, and we will continue to build democracy. I think that is what we all should be about.

I would like to thank Doug Tanner. Four years ago when I first heard about him putting together this annual civil rights tour, I thought that it was a great idea, even though I had some apprehensions; not because of the thought of violence, but I wanted to know how it would come off and what would be the ramifications, because just going and being there would only satisfy and help the few of us that had the experience.

But after we came back, Members told me, you know, I saw you on TV. I heard some of the speeches, and I am going next year. Every year someone tells me that they are sorry that they did not go.

So everywhere in America I go now people say, you know, I am coming down to Selma next year. I hope that is indicative of the change in how we think, not only about Selma, but all the problems associated with Selma, because, in reality, Selma is a little America. The people there in every respect represent America; and if we can go there and talk about problems that exist, that is the first step, and it is the very first thing we must do in America.

We cannot hide our past, and we should never forget our past. But as long as we can remember, discuss, and talk about the past and the problems, maybe we are on our way to solving



them, and that is the good thing about the activities and about doing it and being involved.

So, Doug, I really thank you for all your institute is doing; and I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for calling us together tonight so that I could say thank you for coming, so that I can invite you back next year or the year after next, whenever the decision is made when we will go. Also I would like to thank the President for coming and thank America for being there. They were there in so many ways, whether it was by TV, radio, or in spirit. I would like to think that all of us marched this time across the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

Let me thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) for being there 35 years ago, and let me thank the gentleman for being there this time. Let me thank all of you, and I invite you back.

Remember this: Selma is America. You can come there, just as you can go home.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. We appreciate his comments and appreciate his welcome to his district and appreciate his invitation back.

I think I pointed out, and the point that was made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFEL) was apt, that Selma is America, and America can learn lessons from Selma, as Selma needed to learn lessons from America.

Doug Tanner, we all do thank you. You have made our lives richer, more whole, by your ministering to us, ministering to us in a variety of different ways, some of which some would say are religious, some would say secular, but surely ministering to our souls and to our hearts and to our heads so that we will be better persons and treat one another as we would want to be treated.

As I was sitting here and listening to all of you speak, I thought to myself, we rise here every day as we begin this session and pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the republic for which it stands, one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The lesson of Selma is for all. Indivisible. We cannot segregate rights and expect any of us to long enjoy those rights. That, JOHN, is the lesson I think you were teaching to the country, that Martin Luther King, Jr., was teaching to the country.

If you hold truths to be self-evident and you say that all men are created equal and endowed not by the State, not by government, but by God, by their creator, with inalienable rights, then God's creatures mean for all, liberty and justice for all.

JOHN, I think you made us a little more cognizant of what that really means; and as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) has pointed out, it teaches us better how to go home with our friends and neighbors, families and colleagues, and to emphasize how im-

portant it is for our Nation to be better than it is today. As great as it is, as just as it is, it can be better, if we realize that we must have it as a Nation with justice for all.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for giving us this time to commemorate an extraordinary experience in the lives of each one of us.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues. I honor and thank my brother, JOHN LEWIS; and I thank my friend, DOUG TANNER.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I join a number of my colleagues in commemorating the 35th anniversary of the Voting Rights March from Selma to Montgomery. I was honored to be a part of the Faith and Politics Institute's Congressional Civil Rights pilgrimage a couple of weeks ago. It was powerful to hear from those who had experienced the struggle firsthand. It was informative to learn about these historic events while actually at the sites. It was inspiring to walk in the same places as those who stood up for justice.

Thirty-five years ago, our country experienced some of the lowest and highest points in our history. On the one hand, law enforcement agents and elected officials violently opposed the basic democratic right of voting for African Americans. On the other hand, ministers, students and regular citizens stood up for their most basic rights as Americans. Congress responded by passing the Voting Rights Act of 1965, one of the crowning achievements of the Civil Rights Movement.

Unfortunately, the work of Martin Luther King and JOHN LEWIS and so many others is still unfinished. We have made many strides toward equal rights and progress toward racial equality. But the issues surrounding race remain among the biggest challenges facing our country. When we review our country's legacy around slavery, the historical record is still incomplete.

One of the items on that unfinished agenda is that the U.S. government has never apologized for its role in slavery. A few years ago, I saw a television program with a Black minister and a White minister commemorating Dr. Martin Luther King's birthday. They stated that there had never been an official apology for slavery. With my country's Civil War, all that President Abraham Lincoln achieved and the successes of the Civil Rights Movement, I found that hard to believe.

So I went to the Library of Congress and discovered that they were right—no one in the Government of the United States had ever apologized for slavery. Therefore, I set out to correct this glaring omission in history. On June 12, 1997, I introduced my simple resolution without any fanfare.

What happened next was a complete surprise. It exploded on the political scene at about the same time President Clinton was conducting his "National

Dialogue on Race." Both conservatives and liberals, blacks and whites dismissed it as "a meaningless gesture" or "an avoidance of problem-solving." After considering it, President Clinton decided not to apologize because of the fear of legal ramifications.

I received hundreds of letters and phone calls about the apology. Most of the people I heard from opposed the idea and some were blatantly racist and hateful. Very few people stood up and defended the idea and necessity of an apology. At times, I felt very alone in this struggle to do what I know is right.

I know that my resolution will not fix the lingering injustice resulting from slavery. But reconciliation begins with an apology. I hope this apology will be the start of a new healing between the races. I introduced the resolution because it is the right thing to do.

Many of the opponents to the apology argued that slavery had been abolished over a century ago and no one alive in the United States today had been a slave or a slave owner. But that ignores the fact that slavery's effects are still with us.

Just one of the many examples of slavery's legacy is in terms of assets. Slaves, of course, were not able to earn any money or pass on an inheritance to their children. When African-Americans were freed after the Civil War, they started at a distinct disadvantage. Then they were shackled with Jim Crow laws and segregation that prevented them from truly entering into society. Only within the last two generations have descendants of slaves legally able to join American society. Not only was it not a level playing field, the game itself was stacked against people of color.

Now in the 21st Century in the richest nation in the world, blacks control only 1.3 percent of the nation's financial assets, while they are around 12 percent of the population. Whites possess a staggering 95 percent. Almost two-thirds of black households have no net financial assets. Blacks and whites with equal incomes possess very unequal shares of wealth.

Our work is obviously not finished. I am proud to stand up with my colleagues and voice my support for efforts that promote racial reconciliation. My special thanks to JOHN LEWIS and AMO HOUGHTON for organizing the pilgrimage to Alabama and the ongoing "Congressional Conversations on Race." I look forward a time when the record is corrected and we can truly celebrate the accomplishments that have brought about "One America."

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the special order just given.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida). Is there objection

to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

#### NIGHTSIDE CHAT ON TOPICS OF CONCERN TO AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, once again we are here this evening for a little nightside chat. There are a number of different subjects I would like to cover this evening.

I would like to start out by talking about the loss of a good friend that I had last week, just a short comment in that regard. We are going to move on and talk about the Congressional Medal of Honor. We lost one of our heroes. If you want a true definition of hero, take a look at the people that serve in our military forces. We lost one in Colorado. I will talk a little about him. Then I want to move on and talk about the Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms people.

We had a very interesting item in Colorado over the weekend about the enforcement, or lack of enforcement, by the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms department in their inspections regarding firearms sales. As you know, across the country guns have become somewhat of a sensitive issue.

Now, last week when I addressed you, we talked a little on Operation Exile. I know that my colleague, the gentleman from the State of Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), is going to introduce a bill tomorrow to assist our local States and our local communities on their Project Exile, so we will highlight a little of what he is attempting to do. We will talk about our public awareness campaign and talk about some of the responsibilities of gun ownership.

Then, if we have some time this evening, I would like to touch again on the death tax. As many of you know, that is a very punitive tax in our system. It is a tax that has devastating impacts on small businesses, has devastating impacts on farms and ranches across the country; and, frankly, this is not a justified tax.

It is a tax supported by the administration. In fact, the administration has proposed a \$9.5 billion increase in the death tax this year. I am confident that we can stop that. But just so you no, there is a big difference of opinion on the policy of the Democratic administration to raise death taxes and our position on the Republican side that says death taxes are fundamentally unfair, they are unjustified, and they should be eliminated in this country.

But we will get to all that in due time. Let us start first of all with just a comment about a friend of mine, a classmate of mine, a fellow named Richard. I will not go into his last name, but I want to tell Members, my friend committed suicide last week.

I hope that in your walks of life, sometimes we get so busy that we forget that some people have some demons within them that they cannot control, that they are having a difficult time with life.

What I try and do, and it just came back home this last week when I was at the service of this gentleman, and he really was, I think he had some demons he could not control; but it brought back the thought that, gosh, any time we see somebody in some despair, we should always urge them, before they take that step, that ultimate and in some regards very selfish step of suicide, urge them to call a suicide watch or get some assistance.

I am confident that my friend, had my friend just had a few more minutes of being able to calm down and think out the situation, we would have avoided a tragedy; not so much just a tragedy to my friend, but a tragedy to his friends, to his family, to his wife, and to his children. His wife, Anna, is a splendid person. She now faces a tremendous challenge ahead with these children.

The circumstances of this suicide were tragic. I think the circumstances of any suicide are tragic. And if there is a justification for mental health assistance in this country, it is that suicide tragedy that takes place across the entire spectrum, across the entire spectrum of age, every day in this country.

□ 2200

So I just urge my colleagues again, we run at a fast pace around here, but if one has an opportunity to put one's hand on the shoulder of a friend, and I am sure all of my colleagues would do it, and I wish I would have had the opportunity to do it, it might just work; it might just prevent somebody from being in such despair that they ruin the most ultimate gift that God could give us.

#### PUEBLO, COLORADO: HOME OF A HERO, WILLIAM J. CRAWFORD

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about another sad event last week, although the gentleman lived a full life, and that is about a gentleman named William Crawford, a Congressional Medal of Honor winner. My district is the Third Congressional District of Colorado, and just for those of my colleagues that need reminding, that includes most of the mountains of Colorado, all the resorts: Aspen, Colorado; Vail, Steamboat, Telluride; it has the industrial community of Pueblo, it has the San Luis Valley, it has Durango, down there in the Four Corners, the Anasazi ruins, the Colorado National Monuments, part of the Rocky Mountain National Monument, part of the Black Canyon National Monument. As my colleagues can see, any time I talk about my district, I get in kind of a promotional mood because it is such a wonderful district.

But there is another reason that stands out besides the natural beauty of this district and the people of this district, and that is that Pueblo, Colorado is what we call the Home of Heroes. Mr. Speaker, this last week we had four living members from the community who received the Congressional Medal of Honor. This was not awarded, they deserved this, they worked for it. I do not have to go into what the Congressional Medal of Honor means, although in my opinion, any recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor is at the very highest of the echelon as far as a definition of what being an American is all about.

Well, last week we lost one of our four; it was William Crawford. He passed away last Tuesday and actually they were holding a memorial service today at the United States Air Force Academy. I thought I would talk just a little about what Mr. Crawford did and how he earned the Congressional Medal of Honor. I guess the best way to do that is just take directly from the script which described his actions.

But before I do that, let me say that one of the things that causes me some, I guess one would say discouragement, is when I read throughout the sports pages of our newspapers in this country, we read about heroes in sports. My opinion is there are celebrities in sports and there are a lot of talented celebrities in sports, but we really ought to be very cautious and very selfish about the use of the word "heroes." The word "heroes" really should be placed not on sports figures, but figures like William Crawford, figures like the firemen or the policemen that lose their lives. I think we lose a police officer every 28 hours in this country. This year has been a bad year for our firemen as well. We have lost several firemen in the line of duty.

But let us go back to Mr. Crawford. I am not over-using the word when I use the word "hero." He was given this medal and this recognition for conspicuous gallantry at the risk of life above and beyond the call of duty in action with the enemy in Italy on September 13, 1943. When Company I attacked an enemy-held position on hill 424, the 3rd Platoon, in which Private Crawford was a squad scout, attacked as base platoon for the company.

After reaching the crest of the hill, the platoon was pinned down by intense enemy machine gun and small arms fire. Locating one of these guns, which was dug in on a terrace on his immediate front, Private Crawford, without orders and on his own initiative, moved over the hill directly into the line of fire and crawled to a point within a few yards of the gun emplacement and single-handedly stood up and destroyed the machine gun emplacement, killed three of the crew with a hand grenade and thus, enabled his platoon to continue its advance.

So he climbs over the first hill, he is in the direct line of fire of a machine gun, he is able to crawl under the machine gun fire, he gets right up to the

machine gun emplacement, he stands up, he eliminates three of the enemy and throws a hand grenade in and destroys the machine gun emplacement. But it does not stop there.

They go to the next hill and after reaching the crest of that hill, once again they are pinned down by enemy fire, and once again Private Crawford decides unilaterally to do what he can do to save the platoon. He moves forward once again in the face of intense fire and here, instead of one machine gun emplacement we have two machine gun emplacements, but they are side-by-side. As Private Crawford crawls up, he goes first to the left and is able to engage in a hand grenade throw, throwing a hand grenade into the first emplacement, destroys that one and then stands, throws a second hand grenade and using machine gun fire of his own is able to kill the members or eliminate the second machine gun emplacement. But the machine gun was still able to be used, so he jumps into the emplacement, takes over the German machine gun and then turns it on the German troops who were then retreating and was able to provide cover for his platoon while they move into a safer location.

That takes a lot of guts, and for that he was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. His passing is something that we all see with sadness, but I can tell my colleagues that during his 81 years, he lived a good life. He was properly recognized by his country for being what an American is all about, and that is putting duty and honor ahead of self, and that is exactly what Private Crawford did.

#### GASOLINE PRICES OUT OF CONTROL

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, if I could move to another subject. I want to visit with my colleagues a little more, and I have read with some interest about the administration's policy on these high gasoline prices. I am not sure and, in fact, I would guess that the President and the administration and probably all of the cabinet officials, I would be surprised if they pump their own gas.

Mr. Speaker, I have news for my colleagues out there. Somebody better take a look at that price at the gas pump. Now, I know our economy is in the best shape it has been in the history of the country, and we could go into that in some detail. So it gives cause to some people to say oh, well, it is just something we have to live with. But there are a lot of people out there who have jobs, who are just getting by, and that high gasoline price has a huge impact on them. The cost of oil does not just affect gasoline in one's vehicle, by the way, it affects everything we use, everything we use in this country: medicine, production, plastics, rubber, generation of heat, generation of energy, you name it, the list could go on and on and on. This high price of

gasoline is something that the administration's policy, in my opinion, needs to be more focused upon.

Now, it is not like they are ignoring it, but they are not standing up to the cartel. What do you mean the cartel? What is the cartel? Let us talk about what a cartel is first.

I pulled it out of the dictionary. A cartel: a combination of independent, commercial or industrial enterprises, a combination of industrial or commercial enterprises designed to limit competition and fix prices.

Adam Smith, *Wealth of Nations*, talked about a cartel, and the cartel, of course, as my colleagues know, is OPEC. So first of all, let us define what we are dealing with out there and then we will move on, because that helps us have a clear focus on the problem and then we can move on to what I think some of the solutions are.

Let me point out that I think the administration understands, somewhat, the problem. I think they have discounted it because we have such a good economy, and I do not think the administration, the Democrat administration has moved to come up with any kind of solution. I will point out that the policy of the Secretary of Energy is to go over to OPEC and negotiate with them, and the Department expects the price to fall sometime in the future. It actually fell a little today. Well, that does not take a rocket scientist. I think OPEC is realizing, and they are right about at the point where the ball will bounce to bring it down just a little. These negotiations are not going to result in something coming down. The price of oil is probably going to go down anyway in the next couple of months, but not to the extent that it should. That cartel still operates.

How do we deal with a cartel? That is what the administration ought to be looking at. That is the key here. How do we deal with a cartel like OPEC? Let us go back just for a moment, because I know it is somewhat boring, perhaps, but let us look at the books. Probably, in my opinion, one of the greatest philosophers and writers about capitalism in this country, or in the history of the world was Adam Smith. Adam Smith says a cartel, he did not use the word cartel, he called it a monopoly, "A monopoly granted either to an individual or to a trading company has the same effect as a secret in trade or manufactures. The monopolists, by keeping the market constantly understocked, by never fully supplying the effectual demand, sell their commodities much above the natural price, and raise their compensation, whether they consist in wages or profit, greatly above the natural rate."

So we have a system in balance out there. The natural rate is what Adam Smith refers to. But the monopoly allows one to exceed the natural rate.

"The price of a monopoly is upon every occasion the highest which can be gotten. The natural price, or the price that is the result of the market,

on the contrary, is the lowest which can be taken, not upon every occasion, but for any considerable time together. That is the one that is struck by competition. The one that is upon every occasion the highest which can be squeezed out of the buyers, or which, it is supposed, they will consent to give. The other is the lowest which the sellers can commonly afford to take, and at the same time that the sellers can afford to take, but at the same time continue their business." That is an important last few words, continue their business.

My colleagues may be able to pay this price of oil for some period of time, but can we continue our course of business?

"Such enhancements of the market price may last as long as the regulations of police which give occasion to them.

"Monopoly, besides, is a great enemy to good management." Let me repeat that. "Monopoly is a great enemy to good management, which can never be universally established but in consequence of that free and universal competition which forces everybody to have recourse to it for the sake of self defense."

What does all that say? What it says is we have a system in balance out there and if we allow the cartel to proceed on the basis of which this cartel called OPEC is proceeding, these gas prices which are not their natural price, they are the highest price you can pull out, when you allow that cartel to exist without some type of repercussion, it upsets the apple cart, it upsets the market cart, and that is where it comes down. The interpretation is maybe not for those of you who are wealthy, but for those people in this society who are not wealthy, they are the ones that are stung first and they are the ones that are stung the hardest.

I can tell my colleagues that many times in the chamber we deal perhaps with the wealthier class of society, but there is huge part out there that we cannot ignore. There are a lot of people out there that this gas price is hurting and it is stinging, and the administration has an obligation to stand up to this cartel. The administration's policy should be very clear on its action.

The United States has allowed itself to become more and more dependent on foreign oil over the years. There are a number of different reasons. One, the United States has become much less friendly in exploration on its own continent. In fact, many other countries are saying, why should we allow the United States to come into our country to do exploration for oil and take our oil while they are reluctant to do exploration in their own country. That is one factor that has caused our dependence, more dependence on foreign oil.

The other, in my opinion, is that the administration's policy is asleep at the gas pump, let us put it that way. They have been awakened recently, not suddenly; it is kind of like a bear that is

in hibernation: Kind of a slow awareness that there is a gas price problem out there on the market. There is a gas price problem for the average working American, and it impacts their families and it impacts education and it impacts jobs and it impacts our economy.

□ 2215

What do we do about OPEC? Well, let us talk about OPEC first of all. What are the countries of OPEC? I think we should take a look at that: Algeria, Libya, Indonesia, Nigeria, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, UAE, Venezuela. But there are few of them I want to point out specifically. That is the cartel. Those are the countries.

Remember one of the countries I mentioned, Kuwait. Remember how, just a few short years ago, it was American forces that got together and led international forces to take Iraq and force them out of their invasion of this country, Kuwait. We lost American soldiers. We lost young American soldiers, men and women, for this country Kuwait. This is how they show appreciation; they become a member of a cartel to stick it to the United States.

Now, I am not saying they are not entitled to a fair price. The market determines a fair price. Everybody is entitled to a fair price if the product has demand and if you supply what the consumers want. But to go outside the model of the marketplace and put together a monopoly which, by the way, is illegal in our country under most circumstances, to put that together under the form of a cartel, that is where we are out of kilter here.

Now, what do we do? What kind of relationship do we have with some of these countries? Well, some of these countries, we do not trade with them. Iran, although my colleague, I believe the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), noted that last week the Clinton administration's new policy is on caviar and some other products, the United States has now opened the market to Iran. So while this cartel is forcing gas prices to unprecedented highs in this country, the administration's policy is opening up more free trade with Iran.

Let us talk a little about some of the exports. This is kind of a two-way street. In my opinion, the Democratic policy here is kind of close your eyes, it will go down here by its natural self. Let us pretend it is not happening. Stall for a few weeks. Then if we get in a real crisis right before the election, our policy ought to be stand forward and hammer it. But right now, let us just kind of hope it goes away on its own. Well, even if the price drops a little, even if this price goes down, this thing is not going to go away.

We have got to use some leverage. Do not be mistaken. All of the leverage does not belong to OPEC. It does not belong to that cartel. The United States of America and other free countries in this world have some leverage in this situation.

Number one, we ought to go back to our friends, like Kuwait and say, how many years ago was it that we came into your country and gave you your country back? It cost American lives. It cost Americans billions of dollars. But we did it, one, because it was the right thing to do; but, two, we think there should be some appreciation in the future, not to put together this cartel. So that is one point of leverage, we can go to Kuwait.

But we can go to any number of countries. We can go to Algeria. We can go to Indonesia. We can go to Iraq. We can go to Nigeria. We can go to Saudi Arabia. We can go to the UAE and say, hey, do you know what, we do buy oil from you, but you buy products from us. You buy American products. Then we ought to take a look at what those American products are.

Do my colleagues know a lot of the oil that comes out of the ground that OPEC takes out of the ground, they do it with American ingenuity. It is American ingenuity that takes a lot of that oil out of that ground over there in the OPEC nations. So they are using our product.

Take, for example, the steel casing that they put into the well, the drill bits that they go down into the well, the engineering technology of how to make it all come together, a lot of that is American product.

In my opinion, the administration has some leverage there. The Democratic administration needs to stand up and say, wait a minute, what is good for the goose is good for the gander. You guys want to stick it to us on the price of oil. Maybe we ought to stand back up and renegotiate what the price of engineering services from America are. Maybe we ought to talk about the price of American products upon which you are dependent. Maybe we ought to do a little negotiation on products versus products.

Oh, it is great to send over a Secretary and have a cup of coffee and talk to them and say, look, you are really offending us. Let us lower these prices. You have got to get tough. This is the business world out there.

Do not discount this cartel. These are smart people. They figured out America is pretty easy to stick it to because they do not fight back. It is pretty easy to negotiate with this administration because they do not stand up and get tough on some of these issues. I am saying you have got to change that policy.

I think we here in the House should encourage the Clinton administration to be more direct, more forthright, and more forceful, especially stress on the last, more forceful on the leverage that we have with these OPEC nations. Our consumers will be better for it.

Now, I know that the President's policy came out in the last couple weeks and says, well, we need more energy conservation, and we need more solar energy, and we need more efficiency. That is all well and good. I mean, that

is fine. I agree with some of those things. That is not going to happen tomorrow. That is not going to happen next week.

We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars trying to do that right now. Do my colleagues know what, the Government has really never come up with the solution. The people that have come up with the best solutions are the people that have the most to lose. Car efficiencies are not determined by the Government or invented by the Government. They are created by the car manufacturers who know that the consumers out there want more efficiency in their automobiles.

But the point I am trying to make here is that this administration, with our support, ought to stand up to OPEC and say, hey, we are going to talk about these American products. Maybe we ought to put a special fee on American products, maybe 1,000 percent fee or something on those products until you begin to negotiate a little on your oil prices.

As I said, these are smart people. The only way, in my opinion, you can negotiate with tough people is you send tough people in to negotiate with them. You cannot go in to a tough negotiator, show your hand, and frankly, act weak. They smell weakness. They can see it a mile away. They are like a good poker player. They can sense it a long time before you know they have sensed it.

We do not have any reason to go in there with weakness. The United States of America is a strong country. It is a country that has a lot of leverage on this cartel. It is a country that ought to use it so we can bring those gasoline prices down at the pump so that we can get a barrel of oil down to a price that we are not going to impact everything from education to our economy.

Now, we say education. Now that we get education in here, I just saw it the other day that some school has had to curtail their field trips because of the price of fuel to take their buses on these trips. They have had to cut back. That is the only place they thought they could cut back. It is having an impact, I say to the President. The administration ought to know this.

Now, I know in Washington, D.C., there is a lot of black limousines and big fancy cars, and the price of gasoline may not be such a big deal with a lot of the people in the Government. But I am telling my colleagues, even here in Washington, D.C., there is a lot of people that go to work every day that do not drive in a black limousine; and there is a lot of people being impacted by these prices. I think the administration has an obligation to be tough, to get in there and wrestle with these people.

Take a look at what we ship Kuwait, for example. Again, as a reminder, this is the country that we went to war for a few years back, 7 or 8 or 9 years ago. It is a country that we gave lives for.

Here is what Kuwait buys from us: aircraft and associated equipment, civil engineering products, contractor products, pumps, air or other gas compressors, fans, motor vehicles, chemical products, analysis and measuring tools, instruments, heating and cooling equipment, pumps for liquids.

Every category I just mentioned to my colleagues is necessary for the production of oil. Yet, the administration has not mentioned one of those products to the best of our knowledge in their negotiations with OPEC about this cartel that has been formed to stick it to the free world.

So I hope that, although I am not sure, I would hope that some message gets through to the administration that we have got to be a little tougher on these prices, that these prices are having a huge impact, a huge impact on the consumer in America.

Today, we just saw the interest rate go up another quarter of a percent. Well, this is just the beginning of our problems if we do not do something about that gasoline price and the cost of oil.

This last weekend, Mr. Speaker, there was an interesting article in the Denver Post. We are moving to a new subject. I want to talk about guns here for a little while. Last week, I talked about guns. I talked about OPEC as well, because I have not seen anything positive happen in regards to OPEC.

But let us talk about guns. It is a sensitive issue. It is an issue that everybody in the country is concerned about. It is an issue that responsible gun owners are concerned about. It is an issue that manufacturers of guns are concerned about. It is an issue that the Government talks about being concerned about. It is an issue that every one of us in these Chambers are concerned about.

What is responsibility in gun ownership? What is government responsibility in regards to gun ownership? What is the manufacturer's responsibility in regards to gun ownership? Let us visit for a few minutes about that.

Let me begin by saying that the Denver Post ran an article this last weekend. In the Federal Government, we have an agency whose focus is to look and to inspect on behalf of the Government people who sell guns, illegal weapons, and so on. It is called the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, not an agency that has a good reputation, as my colleagues know, because of the disaster at Waco and a number of other issues. They do not exactly have the kind of reputation that the Federal Bureau of Investigation enjoys.

But the ATF, that is the agency we are talking about, they have responsibilities. As I mentioned to my colleagues, when we talk about guns, we want to look at a number of different responsibilities: first, the gun owner; second, the gun manufacturer; third, the gun retailer; and, fourth, the Government.

So the Government's primary agency here is the ATF. Those are the people

that go out into the field. They go, for example, to a gun shop and see if the owner of the gun shop, the proprietor of the gun shop, is in compliance with the law.

Well, the Denver Post is a major newspaper in the State of Colorado. We have two major papers statewide, the Rocky Mountain News and the Denver Post. The Denver Post ran, I guess, a full disclosure or full story on the ATF and what they have done in Colorado. I will tell my colleagues, when they are done reading that story, it is the prime example of bureaucrats that are not doing a darn thing in my opinion. That is a bureaucracy that we ought to take a very close look at.

Look, I am not one of these fanatics that says, get rid of the ATF, or the Government does not have a role in responsible gun ownership. We do have a role in responsible gun ownership. But we ought to begin by cleaning our own house. My colleagues ought to read this story about the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms in the State of Colorado.

Let me go through some of it for my colleagues. The title of the story, "Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms called slow to act."

"Federal regulators let two Colorado gun stores stay in business long after investigators reported they had sold guns to criminals and were operated by men forbidden to possess the weapons."

So the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, this bureaucrat agency that we have got, knew that the owners or the proprietors of these gun shops, one, should not be selling guns, had violated criminal statutes, and, yet, they continue to allow them to operate in their operation.

Two examples. One of them happens to be in my district, by the way. Lakewood, Colorado, the U.S. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms granted a new firearms license to one Lawrence Lockert after State investigators concluded he had repeatedly sold handguns to people disqualified on background checks, including the convicted felon found running his shop.

□ 2230

Lockert kept the license, despite a 1998 restraining order prohibiting him from having weapons as well as bond conditions regarding that restraining order and a 1999 guilty plea to domestic violence charge.

A further comment on that: The records show that the ATF was informed that Lockert sold handguns to people with criminal records nearly 4 years before the agency took action.

So in this Lakewood case, they knew there was a problem. The Colorado Bureau of Investigation, which is a good solid agency in Colorado, informed Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms that the problem existed, Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms knew that the problem existed, and they sat on it for 4 years. For 4 years.

How can we in Washington, how can those of us in elected office from our

local States talk about responsibility of the gun owners when the government itself continues to drop the football on the very basic laws that are already in existence? How can we talk about rushing to the House floor to pass more and more gun laws when the current gun laws we have are being ignored by our own agencies? We need to clean house, and Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms is a place to start.

Let me go further. In CBI, which I mentioned before is the Colorado Bureau of Investigation, they found 10 instances in Lakewood in 18 months in which customers had acquired handguns despite being denied criminal background checks. So, remember, we put in criminal background checks. I happen to agree with that. I do not have a problem with background checks. We put that in effect and, despite the fact that is in place, this dealer ignored it on 10 different occasions. Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms found out he ignored it on 10 different occasions and just turned the other way.

Now, when they were asked for a response, they gave two excuses. One of the excuses was, well, we just kind of lost track of the case. Now, that sounds reassuring. That sounds pretty good to hear from the government. We have a problem out there. We have somebody who ought not to be selling guns, it is against the law, who violated the law on a number of occasions, and they just kind of lost track of the case.

The second excuse here, and I should point out here that I used to be a police officer, and I know when there is a problem, when a mistake is made, the easiest thing to do, as a cop, is to blame it on lack of resources. It is kind of like education. We never hear about the fact we need higher standards. People say, well, we did not have enough money. And that is exactly what Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms said to the Denver Post. We had very limited resources.

Well, that does not work this time. Does not work, Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms. That agency has received increase after increase after increase in their budget, and they are still negligent out there with some pretty critical cases.

Let me talk about the second case. Delta, Colorado, in my district. It is a great community. I hope some of my colleagues have an opportunity to visit. But let me talk about the situation with a gun dealer out there. In Delta, State and Federal agents discovered in 1996 that a man in prison three times on kidnapping and weapons charges was operating a store with a Federal license to sell guns. The ATF let the shop, licensed in the names of his wife and son, sell guns until its license expired more than a year later. Despite the fact there were clear grounds for charges, no charges were filed.

I mean, come on. We need to go after these people. And we need an agency that can do it. Look, I represent the

West, and we have a very independent nature out there. We are not sold that we need big government coming into our back yard there to help us. We are not sold that we need more and more regulations. We happen to believe there are a lot of laws on the books that if enforced could go a long ways towards solving the tragedies that we all acknowledge exist out there. But, dadgummit, every one of us have a right to look at these agencies and tell these bureaucrats to get off dead center.

Today, I am sure that the director of the ATF had on his desk a copy of the article from the Denver Post yesterday morning when he got in, I would hope by 9 a.m. in the morning. When he got in and looked at that article, he should have been on the phone 2 hours later saying, all right, which agents were responsible for this? What kind of action have these agents taken? What is being done by the supervisor for the Colorado region to make sure it never happens again? What is being done to make sure it does not repeat itself? I mean this guy ought to be, or this gal, ought to be enraged. Whoever runs that agency ought to be enraged.

My bet is not much has happened over there at the slow moving Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms. Now, I am not talking about all of the agents. We have some good people that work for that agency out there. But we have to look at the historical basis. We look at performance. We look at standards. In my opinion, the Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms, on a number of occasions, whether we talk about Waco or any number of cases, but when we talk about Colorado, the ATF has failed us. They have failed the people of the State of Colorado and they have failed the people they work for, which are the people of the United States. We are not enforcing the laws that are on the books.

Well, that moves me into the next subject, a subject that is dear to my heart. We will have a bill introduced tomorrow by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. McCOLLUM), the prime sponsor. It is a good bill and it highlights a project that I talked about last week, but I think it is important enough to talk about it again. We are trying to do everything we can and all of us, colleagues, every one of us in this chamber, we need to help step up public awareness of this project.

This project, Colorado Project Exile, now, obviously the bill the gentleman from Florida is introducing tomorrow is Project Exile from a national level, but I want to talk a little more about what we are doing in Colorado. We all know that the Columbine situation that occurred there. We know the sensitivities that are happening across this country. So Colorado is a good place to talk about. It is a State that prides itself on its independence. It is a State in which a lot of its citizens own weapons. It is a State that has belief in the second amendment of the Constitu-

tion, but it is also a State that has stepped forward and taken a very aggressive stance on its Project Exile.

Colorado's Project Exile has received bipartisan support from Democrats and Republicans. Our Democrat Attorney General Ken Salazar and his staff, very competent, they are in the lead on this. Tom Strickland, Democrat U.S. Attorney, he is the guy that put this project together in the State of Colorado. Our governor, who in my opinion is the finest governor in the history of the State of Colorado, Bill Owens, and his cabinet, they are behind us 100 percent and helping us with resources. Every sheriff's department, to the best of my knowledge, every police department, every newspaper in the State of Colorado, has endorsed this project.

The beauty of this project is it does not require one more law. Not one more law. It is not saying, U.S. House of Representatives get together and put together some more gun legislation. It is not going to the State legislature of the State of Colorado and saying we do not have enough laws on guns. It is a focused effort to take a look at the laws we have and how can we enforce that to bring about responsibility.

Now, I can say, and I should say, to do credit to Richmond, Virginia, that is where Project Exile got kind of its original start, to the best of my knowledge. What happened in that community is that in 1997, Richmond, Virginia, suffered the second highest per capita murder rate in the country. They implemented this project, what they called Project Exile. And why the words Project Exile? Obviously, project is self-explanatory. Exile is, hey, you do the crime, you do the time kind of philosophy; except here, you break the law, we exile you to prison. You are going to pay the price. There is going to be a consequence for breaking the law.

And there ought to be a consequence. And the consequence in Richmond, Virginia, is going to be immediate. It is going to be severe and it will mean something. And in Richmond, Virginia, we are going to go out and do public awareness. And in Virginia we are going to go out and have the public help us with public awareness. Just like the crime marches program. We want the people to get the word out.

The second amendment is an amendment worth standing up for. But if someone abuses the responsibility, if they are violating the law, they are going to pay a price for it because we do not want to tolerate it. It is kind of like good cop, bad cop. The best thing good cops could do, the best thing good cops could do, having been a former cop, is get rid of the bad cops. That is the best thing to do. It is the same thing here. The best those of us who believe in the second amendment could do is do something about the people who violate the law. And that is what Project Exile is about.

In 1998, after they initiated this, their homicides dropped by a third. Al-

most immediately their homicides dropped by a third. Their project involved Federal, State and local authority, and so does ours in Colorado, and we will go through that in a little more detail here in a bit. Under Project Exile in Virginia, 390 defendants were prosecuted in Federal Court in a very short period of time.

What we did in Colorado is we have adopted the same program, and this is a poster that I have here that is a duplicate of billboards that we have gone out with throughout the State of Colorado. And let me tell my colleagues that we have also had not just participation from Tom Strickland and Ken Salazar and Bill Owens and Russell George and Ray Powers, who is president of the Senate, president of the House respectively, we have also got help from the business community. We have got help from the citizens of Colorado.

We have made this a partnership. We have got assistance from the Federal government. And the McCollum bill, which will be introduced tomorrow on Project Exile, will go a long ways in helping make the Federal Government a bigger partner. But we have taken the U.S. Attorney's Office, who has coordinated it with the State Attorney General's office, with the State governor, and then we have gone to the business community and said help us fund this advertising campaign; help us get out the message that in Colorado if you break the law, you pay the price, and help us pay the price.

That is why I am so upset with the ATF. They have dropped the ball in Colorado and, darn it, they ought to get back there and do their job. They have an obligation to us to do their job.

Well, what our exile law does, and, as I said, it does not require one more new law, no more new laws, it goes out and says, hey, first of all, we want to make sure every police officer in the State of Colorado knows what the Federal gun laws are. We are going on the assumption, and it is a good assumption to make, that every police officer in the State of Colorado already knows what their municipal laws are in regards to guns, they already know what their State laws are in regards to guns, but they probably do not, understandably, know quickly what the Federal gun laws are. So we are giving them each a laminated placard, just like this, and very briefly it states what the Federal gun laws are. So if they make a stop or they have a contact with a suspect who has a weapon, they can very quickly scan this card. And if they see a violation, they can do something with it.

What we have decided to do under our Project Exile is, any time a suspect is arrested with a gun violation or some kind of criminal activity that involves a gun, we immediately coordinate our municipal laws that are already in existence, our local laws, county laws that are already in existence, and our State and Federal laws

that are already in existence. We then send it over to what we call our gun squad. The gun squad is a squad made up of prosecutors in these different agencies, primarily led by the U.S. Attorney's Office, again Tom Strickland. And what they do is they quickly do an evaluation on these violations and say, hey, this fella violated a Federal law. We can be tougher under the Federal law than we can the State law, so let us prosecute this in the Federal courts.

In other words, what we are doing is we are putting an awareness campaign out there that if a violation of the law in Colorado in regards to guns, is going to be met with the toughest law we have on the books, we are going after that violator with the toughest law we have on the books. Why? Because the people who are breaking the law, frankly, are putting a bad reputation on those who are following the law.

And, remember, possession of the weapon is not the big problem, it is misuse of the weapon. A lot of times in these chambers what we focus on is possession of the weapon. It is a diversion. It is a red herring. What we need to focus on is the misuse. And that is what Project Exile does.

Now, in our public awareness campaign we put, pack an illegal gun, pack your bags for prison. Report illegal guns, and we give a 1-800 number. One of the more successful programs we have had, as my colleagues know in their own neighborhoods, is crime watchers.

□ 2245

You call up, we give 1-800 names to turn in people. We offer rewards. We do not have to know your name; Crime Stoppers, different programs, Project Thief, things like that.

We think we can reach the same kind of success here. If we know somebody has a fully automatic weapon, it is obviously illegal. Call us on the 1-800 number, we will go after them. We have got response teams. We are going to respond to this, just like we respond to bank robbers. The alarm goes off, we respond. We hit it hard. We hit it fast.

There was a day where bank robberies were out of control in this country. We put together a responsive effort; that is what we are attempting to do here too. We have got some bad characters out there who are abusing the responsibilities, who are breaking the law, abusing the responsibilities as a citizen; we want to make them pay the price.

Project Exile in Colorado is working, and it is only a few months old. We have seen dramatic results. We have seen excellent cooperation between the different law enforcement agencies. It is working. We did not pass the new law in Colorado in regards to this. We have gone into the books, we dusted them off, and it is working.

We are also advocating and going after, and kudos to the Denver Post in Colorado for looking at the Federal agencies that are responsible and have

a responsibility in this partnership who are sitting on their duffs, and that is exactly what the ATF in Colorado has done.

You can be assured that when I go to Colorado, the ATF is not going to be very happy with me. I do not care. Do your job. You have got an obligation.

Back to Project Exile. Let me say a few concluding remarks. This is important. This will work. I know that there has been a lot of propaganda out there. There has been a lot of people on both sides of the aisle. You have got the handgun control outfits. You have got the NRA, all of these people.

There has been a lot of discussion out there about guns. Most of the discussions that are taking place out there, especially in regards to more laws, and more laws are not going to have the kind of impact that we are led to believe they will have. Do not be misled. It feels good. A lot of the propositions that come before us on this House floor are feel-good propositions. They make you think that you are doing something to help address this gun violence problem we have in this country.

There is not a Member in this Chamber that does not want to do something about this violence. We are sickened by it just like our constituents. We want to do something, but do not be misled on some of these feel-good bills. This is not a misleading deal. This is not feel-good.

This is, where is the meat? There is the meat right there. Project Exile has the meat. Project Exile raises the stakes for the people that want to break the law. Project Exile incorporates a partnership, our citizens, our constituents, our businesses, to help us pay for those billboards, our law enforcement agencies, in coordination to go after these people. It will work, give it a chance.

It worked in Richmond, Virginia. It is working in Colorado. It is going to work clear across this country as more and more communities adopt the Project Exile philosophy.

Let me move to an entirely different subject, one I want to visit for a minute about the death tax. It is kind of interesting. I met a young person today. I guess this young person was about 15 years old. He talked to me about his family, his grandpa. Apparently, his grandfather is sick or has passed away; and he said, my family is getting hit real hard with this tax. Can you tell me a little about the tax?

Well, I did not have an opportunity to visit with the young person, but I hope to later. Let me tell you what this country does. As you know, we have to have taxes. Obviously, we have to have taxes in this country. We need to fund our defense. We need to fund our transportation, et cetera, et cetera. But years and years ago, because some people in this country thought that other people in this country were too wealthy and that we really ought to transfer wealth instead of through work or instead of through the ADAM

SMITH philosophy, we ought to transfer wealth by going to the wealthy people and saying we taxed you throughout your life; but upon death, we are going to go ahead and tax property that has already been taxed. That is a clever way to redistribute wealth.

Let us just defy the age-old proven theory of ADAM SMITH and the open market. Let us just transfer, redistribute wealth by taking from the rich and giving to the poor, the old Robin Hood philosophy. That is kind of the beginnings of the death tax in this country.

Is the death tax justified? No. It defies the logic of what our system is built upon. We all carry a fair share, but redistribution of wealth through taxation does not work. What does the death tax do?

I will tell what kind of impact, and colleagues you know this. If you do not, go out there and look at any small business in this country, if they have been in business very long, if their business has grown very fast, or if the homes that your constituents reside in for very long, they can easily be facing the punitive action of the Federal Government coming in upon their death and imposing a tax on their estate. It is called the death tax. It is unfair.

Now, remember it would be fair, I would guess, if you had some property out there where the fair share of tax had not been paid on it and you came in and said, you know, you have not paid your fair share of tax, so we are going to assess a tax. But that is not what happened in the death tax. In the death tax, you are being taxed, with the exception of some IRA accounts; but that is very limited. You are being taxed on property that you have already paid taxes on at least once, probably two or three times.

It is devastating. In districts like mine, where we have lots of ranches; we have lots of small family operations. These families cannot go out and afford the life insurance. I had one fellow say to me, look, just tell these ranchers to go out and buy life insurance, so when they pass away they can still pass the property on to their family, because the life insurance pays for the taxes.

I said wake up, you are going on the assumption that there is enough money made in ranching and farming and small business to pay the kind of premiums that are necessary to give the Government that kind of money. It does not happen.

And what happens in Colorado? For example, take a ranch, take a family ranch, one of the things that we are proud of in Colorado, you are proud of in Pennsylvania, you are proud anywhere that you have got open space, is we have families who have generation after generation worked and tilled the land that they support themselves and their neighbors off of, and they take a lot of pride in that.

Now, they face all kinds of obstacles in being a small rancher, a farmer, the



market, number one, the commodity prices falling, the costs of doing business. Do you think on top of it we ought to give them the biggest obstacle of all, and that is their own government coming in and saying, upon your death, we are going to tax you again on this property?

In Colorado, when you go into a small ranch and you do that, you know what then, instead of ranching being, perhaps, the use of the property that is desired, it then develops into highest and best use theory, which means you take that 3,000-acre ranch and divide it up into 35-acre partials and build homes all over it. It is the only way really in a lot of circumstances, if you do not have the wealth to afford life insurance, you can get out of this taxation.

I want people to be aware that there is a distinct difference between the Democrats, the administration's policy on the estate tax, the death tax, and the Republicans. The Republicans have, and I am not trying to be partisan here, but this is a partisan issue. This death tax has become a partisan issue. The Republicans are saying that this is an unfair tax on its face.

It is punitive on its face. The Democratic administration has come in and now this year in their budget, in the Clinton-Gore budget, they have proposed an increase in the estate tax, an increase, not help us get rid of it. I mean, the least they could do is help neutralize it or not raise it, but the Clinton-Gore administration has come in and said we are going to raise the estate tax.

And for any of my colleagues that might shake their heads, cannot believe it, take a look at the budget proposal. It is in there, a \$9.5 billion increase. The estate tax is fundamentally unfair, and we should do something about that.

In conclusion, as you know, we covered a bunch of different topics this evening. If I were to say what was the most important, it is, one, Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, get out there and do your job in Colorado. You have got the resources. Do not use it as an excuse. The people deserve more from your agency.

Number two, Project Exile will work. Help us. Adopt it in your States; talk to your constituents about Project Exile. And, congratulations, by the way, to all of the partners in our Project Exile partnership in Colorado, whether it is Tom Strickland; Ken Salazar; my friend, Bill Owens; Ross George; Ray Powers; whoever it is out there, you are doing a good. We are going to make it work.

□ 2300

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2317

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida) at 11 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 1287, NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2000

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-532) on the resolution (H. Res. 444) providing for consideration of the Senate bill (S. 1287) to provide for the storage of spent nuclear fuel pending completion of the nuclear waste repository, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3822, OIL PRICE REDUCTION ACT OF 2000

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-533) on the resolution (H. Res. 445) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3822) to reduce, suspend, or terminate any assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to each country determined by the President to be engaged in oil price fixing to the detriment of the United States economy, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of being unavoidably detained.

Mrs. LOWEY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mr. McNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mr. CRANE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the next month on account of medical reasons.

Mr. GREENWOOD (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of participating in a CODEL to India.

Mr. ROYCE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of participating in a CODEL to India.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FORD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BERKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RAMSTAD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Florida, for 5 minutes, March 22.

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today, March 22, and March 23.

Mr. CAMP, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, March 28.

Mrs. BIGGERT, for 5 minutes, March 22.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, March 27.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today and March 22.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, March 22.

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution recognizing and honoring the members of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association (AHEPA) who are being awarded the AHEPA Medal for Military Service for service in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 22, 2000, at 10:30 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6694. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Importation of Pork and Pork Products From Yucatan and Sonora, Mexico [Docket No. 97-079-2] (RIN: 0579-AA91) received January 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6695. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Domestically Produced and Imported Peanuts; Change in the Maximum Percentage of Foreign Material Allowed Under Quality Requirements [Docket Nos. FV99-997-2 FIR, FV99-998-1FIR, and FV99-999-1 FIR] received January 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6696. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement, Department of the Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Cargo Preference-Subcontracts for Commercial Items [DFARS Case 98-D014] received March 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6697. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Federal Prison Industries Waiver Threshold [DFARS Case 2000-D005] received March 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6698. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Construction and Service Contracts in Noncontiguous States [DFARS Case 99-D308] received March 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6699. A letter from the Chairman, the Appraisal Subcommittee, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting the 1999 Annual Report of the Appraisal Subcommittee of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 3332; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6700. A letter from the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Department of the Treasury, Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the Department's final rule—Financial Subsidiaries and Operating Subsidiaries [Docket No. 00-07] (RIN: 1557-AB60) received March 9, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6701. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a transaction involving U.S. exports to the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6702. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Medical Devices; Anesthesiology Devices; Classification of Nitric Oxide Administration Apparatus, Nitric Oxide Analyzer, and Nitrogen Dioxide Analyzer [Docket No. 96P-0436] received March 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6703. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Medical Device Reporting; Manufacturer Reporting, Importer Reporting, User Facility Reporting, Distributor Reporting [Docket No. 98N-0170] received January 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6704. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Amendments to

the List of Regulated Substances and Thresholds for Accidental Release Prevention; Flammable Substances Used as Fuel or Held for Sale as Fuel at Retail Facilities [FRL-6550-1] (RIN: 2050-AE74) received March 9, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6705. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Schedule of Fees for Consular Services; Finance and Accounting; Passports and Visas—received March 9, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

6706. A letter from the Manager Analyst, Office of Inspector General, Department of Justice, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Inspector General for the period April 1, 1999, through September 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6707. A letter from the Acting Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, Office of Governmentwide Policy, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Non-displacement of Qualified Workers-Commercial Items [FAC 97-15; FAR Case 99-600; Item X] (RIN: 9000-A138) received January 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6708. A letter from the Acting Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, Office of Governmentwide Policy, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Review of Award Fee Determination (BURNSIDE-Ott) [FAC 97-15; FAR Case 98-017; Item IX] (RIN: 9000-A135) received January 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6709. A letter from the General Counsel, National Science Foundation, transmitting the Foundation's final rule—Revision of Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act Regulations and Implementation of Electronic Freedom of Information Act Amendments of 1996 (RIN: 3145-AA31 and—AA32) received March 9, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6710. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock by Vessels Catching Pollock for Processing by the Mothership Component in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 000211040-0040-01; I.D. 022800C] received March 9, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6711. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—DIC Benefits for Survivors of Certain Veterans Rated Totally Disabled at Death (RIN: 2900-AJ65) received January 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

6712. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Application of Producers' Good Versus Consumers' Good Test In Determining Country of Origin Marking [T.D. 00-15] received March 9, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6713. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Depart-

ment's final rule—Extension of Import Restrictions Imposed on Certain Categories of Archaeological Material from the Prehispanic Cultures of the Republic of El Salvador [T.D. 00-16] (RIN: 1515-AC61) received March 9, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 444. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (S. 1287) to provide for the storage of spent nuclear fuel pending completion of the nuclear waste repository, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-532). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 445. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3822) to reduce, suspend, or terminate any assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to each country determined by the President to be engaged in oil price fixing to the detriment of the United States economy, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-533). Referred to the House Calendar.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3903. A bill to deem the vessel *M/V Mist Cove* to be less than 100 gross tons, as measured under chapter 145 of title 46, United States Code (Rept. 106-531). Referred to the Private Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HOYER:

H.R. 4037. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to improve the efficiency of the Federal Election Commission, to authorize appropriations for the Commission for fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.R. 4038. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to address the issue of mother-to-child transmission of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) in Africa, Asia, and Latin America; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.R. 4039. A bill to authorize microfinance and food assistance for communities affected by the Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS), and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCARBOROUGH (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MICA, Ms. NOR-TON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 4040. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a program under which long-term care insurance is made available to Federal employees, members of the uniformed services, and civilian and military retirees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. STARK, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. WEYGAND):

H.R. 4041. A bill to prevent children from using tobacco products, to reduce the health costs attributable to tobacco products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. STARK, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WEYGAND, and Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 4042. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, Cosmetic Act to clarify the jurisdiction of the Food and Drug Administration over tobacco; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BALDACCIO (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. SANDERS):

H.R. 4043. A bill to permit the drawdown of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve when oil and gas prices in the United States rise sharply because of anticompetitive activity, to provide credits against income tax for certain energy efficiency improvements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 4044. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow all taxpayers a credit against income tax for up to \$200 of charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mr. HAYES, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 4045. A bill to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to provide enhanced penalties for crimes of violence against children under age 13; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILCHREST (for himself, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. GREENWOOD):

H.R. 4046. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to recover depleted fish stocks and promote the long-term sustainability of marine fisheries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. NEY, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 4047. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide life imprison-

ment for repeat offenders who commit sex offenses against children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself, Mrs. CUBIN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CANON, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. WELDON of Florida):

H.R. 4048. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit to individuals who donate their organs at death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. COBURN, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. RILEY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. VITTER):

H.R. 4049. A bill to establish the Commission for the Comprehensive Study of Privacy Protection; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. BAKER):

H.R. 4050. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that certain deductions of school bus owner-operators shall be allowable in computing adjusted gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLINK (for himself, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. WYNN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. COYNE, and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut):

H. Con. Res. 291. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress concerning drawdowns of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve; to the Committee on Commerce.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 49: Ms. DEGETTE.  
H.R. 110: Mr. OWENS and Mr. BENTSEN.  
H.R. 303: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 347: Mr. BONILLA.  
H.R. 488: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.  
H.R. 515: Ms. MCKINNEY.  
H.R. 531: Mr. CHAMBLISS.  
H.R. 566: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

H.R. 664: Mr. McDERMOTT.  
H.R. 742: Mr. McNULTY.  
H.R. 1041: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.  
H.R. 1044: Mr. CAMP, Mr. HAYES, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 1046: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.  
H.R. 1055: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. TRAFICANT.  
H.R. 1102: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 1196: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1257: Ms. GRANGER.  
H.R. 1261: Mr. GOODLING.  
H.R. 1304: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.  
H.R. 1349: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1389: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DICKS, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.  
H.R. 1398: Mr. HAYWORTH.  
H.R. 1503: Mr. MINGE.  
H.R. 1637: Mr. LAFALCE.  
H.R. 1704: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.  
H.R. 1769: Mr. OWENS and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 1776: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. BOEHNER.

H.R. 1984: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.  
H.R. 2025: Ms. CARSON.  
H.R. 2059: Mr. FROST and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 2121: Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 2149: Mr. GILMAN and Mr. SCOTT.  
H.R. 2308: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.  
H.R. 2349: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 2562: Mr. BACA.  
H.R. 2564: Mr. ROGAN.  
H.R. 2573: Mr. BALDACCIO and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2641: Mr. SKEEN.  
H.R. 2720: Mr. GILCHREST.  
H.R. 2725: Mr. PHELPS.  
H.R. 2738: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2749: Mr. CANNON.  
H.R. 2788: Mr. MINGE.  
H.R. 2789: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. FROST.  
H.R. 2814: Mr. WISE and Mr. RAHALL.  
H.R. 2817: Mr. CROWLEY and Mrs. KELLY.  
H.R. 2870: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 2883: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 2929: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2934: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FORD, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3058: Mr. MCCOLLUM.  
H.R. 3091: Mr. CRAMER.  
H.R. 3113: Mr. PICKERING, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 3193: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MICA, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 3224: Ms. KAPTUR.  
H.R. 3244: Mr. STARK and Mr. DEMINT.  
H.R. 3301: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.  
H.R. 3327: Mr. HERGER.  
H.R. 3379: Mr. BONIOR.  
H.R. 3444: Mr. SIMPSON.  
H.R. 3453: Mr. HALL of Ohio.  
H.R. 3479: Mrs. CLAYTON.  
H.R. 3535: Mr. GOODLING.  
H.R. 3545: Mr. SANDERS.  
H.R. 3552: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 3570: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.  
H.R. 3573: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 3575: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BALDACCIO, and Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 3593: Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, and Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 3594: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 3610: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. LEE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 3629: Mr. McKEON.  
H.R. 3634: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 3641: Mr. EHRLICH.  
H.R. 3656: Mr. TRAFICANT.  
H.R. 3660: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. TOOMEY.

H.R. 3682: Mr. KUCINICH.  
H.R. 3694: Mr. NETHERCUTT.  
H.R. 3702: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. PASCRELL.  
H.R. 3710: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3767: Mr. BENTSEN.  
H.R. 3823: Mr. RUSH, Mr. FROST, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H.R. 3831: Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 3836: Mr. FROST and Mr. MATSUI.  
 H.R. 3844: Mr. SCARBOROUGH.  
 H.R. 3849: Mr. TANCREDI.  
 H.R. 3850: Mr. PETRI and Mr. BURR of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 3873: Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. FROST, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. NADLER.  
 H.R. 3875: Mr. BARR of Georgia.  
 H.R. 3880: Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. NADLER.  
 H.R. 3884: Mr. BALDACCIO and Mr. MARTINEZ.  
 H.R. 3911: Ms. DeGETTE.  
 H.R. 3915: Mr. GOODLING.  
 H.R. 3916: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. ROEMER.  
 H.R. 3983: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. GONZALEZ.  
 H.R. 3985: Mr. DEUTSCH.  
 H.R. 3998: Mr. GEJDENSON and Mrs. CAPPS.  
 H.R. 4006: Mr. ENGLISH.  
 H.R. 4033: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. KLINK, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HOYER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. DANNER, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. McGOVERN, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. McDERMOTT.  
 H.J. Res. 53: Ms. DANNER.  
 H. Con. Res. 249: Mr. LANTOS and Mr. ROHR-ABACHER.  
 H. Con. Res. 252: Mr. BONILLA and Mr. BONIOR.  
 H. Con. Res. 260: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. ROGERS.  
 H. Con. Res. 266: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. COBURN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BOYD, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SCHAFER, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. FROST, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. HOLT.  
 H. Con. Res. 273: Mr. WEYGAND.  
 H. Con. Res. 285: Mr. CRANE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. BISHOP.  
 H. Res. 213: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.  
 H. Res. 437: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 701: Mr. PACKARD.  
 H.R. 3844: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

#### AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3822

OFFERED BY: MR. BACHUS

AMENDMENT No. 4: Page 8, after line 2 insert the following:

#### SEC. 7. DENIAL OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FROM INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

Title XV of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 2620-2620-2) is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### "SEC. 1504. DENIAL OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR MAJOR OIL EXPORTING COUNTRIES ENGAGED IN PRICE FIXING.

"The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director at each international financial institution (as defined in section 1701(c)(2)) to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States at the institution to urge the institution to adopt as a matter of policy and practice not to provide financial assistance of any kind to a country determined by the President pursuant to section 5 of the Oil Price Reduction Act of 2000 to be engaged in oil price fixing to the detriment of the United States economy."

Redesignate succeeding sections accordingly.

H.R. 3822

OFFERED BY: MR. BALDACCIO

AMENDMENT No. 5: At the end of the bill insert the following new sections:

#### SEC. 8. CREDIT FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING HOMES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to nonrefundable personal credits) is amended by inserting after section 25A the following new section:

#### "SEC. 25B. ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING HOMES.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to 20 percent of the amount paid or incurred by the taxpayer for qualified energy efficiency improvements installed during such taxable year.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) MAXIMUM CREDIT.—The credit allowed by this section with respect to a dwelling shall not exceed \$2,000.

"(2) PRIOR CREDIT AMOUNTS FOR TAXPAYER ON SAME DWELLING TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—If a credit was allowed to the taxpayer under subsection (a) with respect to a dwelling in 1 or more prior taxable years, the amount of the credit otherwise allowable for the taxable year with respect to that dwelling shall not exceed the amount of \$2,000 reduced by the sum of the credits allowed under subsection (a) to the taxpayer with respect to the dwelling for all prior taxable years.

"(c) CARRYFORWARD OF UNUSED CREDIT.—If the credit allowable under subsection (a) exceeds the limitation imposed by section 26(a) for such taxable year reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under subpart A of part IV of subchapter A (other than this section), such excess shall be carried to the succeeding taxable year and added to the credit allowable under subsection (a) for such taxable year.

"(d) QUALIFIED ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENTS.—For purposes of this section, the term 'qualified energy efficiency improvements' means any energy efficient building envelope component, and any energy efficient heating, cooling, or water heating appliance, the installation of which, by itself or in combination with other such components or appliances, is certified to improve the annual energy performance of the existing home by at least 30 percent, if—

"(1) such component or appliance is installed in or on a dwelling—

"(A) located in the United States, and

"(B) owned and used by the taxpayer as the taxpayer's principal residence (within the meaning of section 121),

"(2) the original use of such component or appliance commences with the taxpayer, and

"(3) such component or appliance reasonably can be expected to remain in use for at least 5 years.

Such certification shall be made by the contractor who installed such improvements, a local building regulatory authority, or a qualified energy consultant (such as a utility or an accredited home energy rating system provider).

"(e) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(1) TENANT-STOCKHOLDER IN COOPERATIVE HOUSING CORPORATION.—In the case of an individual who is a tenant-stockholder (as defined in section 216) in a cooperative housing corporation (as defined in such section), such individual shall be treated as having paid his tenant-stockholder's proportionate share (as defined in section 216(b)(3)) of the cost of qualified energy efficiency improvements made by such corporation.

"(2) CONDOMINIUMS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual who is a member of a condominium management association with respect to a condominium which he owns, such individual shall be treated as having paid his proportionate share of the cost of qualified energy efficiency improvements made by such association.

"(B) CONDOMINIUM MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'condominium management association' means an organization which meets the requirements of paragraph (1) of section 528(c) (other than subparagraph (E) thereof) with respect to a condominium project substantially all of the units of which are used as residences.

"(f) BASIS ADJUSTMENT.—For purposes of this subtitle, if a credit is allowed under this section for any expenditure with respect to any property, the increase in the basis of such property which would (but for this subsection) result from such expenditure shall be reduced by the amount of the credit so allowed.

"(g) APPLICATION OF SECTION.—Subsection (a) shall apply to qualified energy efficiency improvements installed during the period beginning on January 1, 2000, and ending on December 31, 2004."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (c) of section 23 of such Code is amended by striking "and section 1400C" and inserting "and sections 25B and 1400C".

(2) Subparagraph (C) of section 25(e)(1) of such Code is amended by striking "and 1400C" and inserting ", 25B, and 1400C".

(3) Subsection (d) of section 1400C of such Code is amended by inserting "and section 25B" after "other than this section".

(4) Subsection (a) of section 1016 of such Code is amended by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (26), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (27) and inserting "; and", and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(28) to the extent provided in section 25B(f), in the case of amounts with respect to which a credit has been allowed under section 25B."

(5) The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 25A the following new item:

"Sec. 25B. Energy efficiency improvements to existing homes."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 1999.

#### SEC. 9. CREDIT FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENTS BY SMALL BUSINESSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to business related credits) is amended by inserting after section 45C the following new section:

**"SEC. 45D. ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENTS BY SMALL BUSINESSES.**

"(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 38, in the case of an eligible small business, the energy efficiency improvement credit determined under this section for the taxable year is an amount equal to 20 percent of the basis of each qualified energy efficiency improvements placed in service during such taxable year.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) MAXIMUM CREDIT.—The credit allowed by this section for the taxable year shall not exceed \$2,000.

"(2) COORDINATION WITH REHABILITATION AND ENERGY CREDITS.—For purposes of this section—

"(A) the basis of any property referred to in subsection (a) shall be reduced by that portion of the basis of any property which is attributable to qualified rehabilitation expenditures (as defined in section 47(c)(2)) or to the energy percentage of energy property (as determined under section 48(a)), and

"(B) expenditures taken into account under either section 47 or 48(a) shall not be taken into account under this section.

"(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) ELIGIBLE SMALL BUSINESS.—The term 'eligible small business' means any person engaged in a trade or business if the average annual gross receipts of such person (or any predecessor) for the 3-taxable-year period ending with such prior taxable year does not exceed \$10,000,000. Rules similar to the rules of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 448(c) shall apply for purposes of the preceding sentence.

"(2) QUALIFIED ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENTS.—The term 'qualified energy efficiency improvements' means any energy efficient property the installation of which, by itself or in combination with other such property, is certified to improve the annual energy performance of the structure to which it relates by at least 30 percent, if—

"(A) such property is installed in or on a structure located in the United States,

"(B)(i) the construction, reconstruction, or erection of such property is completed by the taxpayer, or

"(ii) such property which is acquired by the taxpayer if the original use of such property commences with the taxpayer,

"(C) depreciation (or amortization in lieu of depreciation) is allowable with respect to such property, and

"(D) such property reasonably can be expected to remain in use for at least 5 years. Such certification shall be made by the contractor who installed such property, a local building regulatory authority, or a qualified energy consultant (such as a utility or an accredited energy rating system provider).

"(3) ENERGY EFFICIENT PROPERTY.—The term 'energy efficient property' means—

"(A) any energy efficient building envelope component, and

"(b) any energy efficient heating, cooling, or water heating appliance.

"(d) APPLICATION OF SECTION.—Subsection (a) shall apply to property placed in service during the period beginning on January 1, 2000, and ending on December 31, 2004."

(b) CREDIT MADE PART OF GENERAL BUSINESS CREDIT.—Subsection (b) of section 38 of such Code (relating to current year business credit) is amended by striking "plus" at the end of paragraph (11), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (12) and inserting "plus", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(13) in the case of an eligible small business (as defined in section 45D(c)), the energy efficiency improvement credit determined under section 45D."

(c) CREDIT ALLOWED AGAINST REGULAR AND MINIMUM TAX.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 38 of such Code (relating to limitation based on amount of tax) is amended by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4) and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) SPECIAL RULES FOR SMALL BUSINESS ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENT CREDIT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of the energy efficiency improvement credit—

"(i) this section and section 39 shall be applied separately with respect to the credit, and

"(ii) in applying paragraph (1) to the credit—

"(I) subparagraph (A) thereof shall not apply, and

"(II) the limitation under paragraph (1) (as modified by subclause (I)) shall be reduced by the credit allowed under subsection (a) for the taxable year (other than the energy efficiency improvement credit).

"(B) ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENT CREDIT.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'energy efficiency improvement credit' means the credit allowable under subsection (a) by reason of section 45D."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subclause (II) of section 38(c)(2)(A)(ii) of such Code is amended by inserting "or the energy efficiency improvement credit" after "employment credit".

(d) LIMITATION ON CARRYBACK.—Subsection (d) of section 39 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(9) NO CARRYBACK OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENT CREDIT BEFORE EFFECTIVE DATE.—No portion of the unused business credit for any taxable year which is attributable to the credit determined under section 45D may be carried back to any taxable year ending before the date of the enactment of section 45D."

(e) DEDUCTION FOR CERTAIN UNUSED BUSINESS CREDITS.—Subsection (c) of section 196 of such Code is amended by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (8) and inserting "and", and by adding after paragraph (8) the following new paragraph:

"(9) the energy efficiency improvement credit determined under section 45D."

(f) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 45C the following new item:

"Sec. 45D. Energy efficiency improvements by small businesses."

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after the date of the enactment of this Act.

H.R. 3822

OFFERED BY: MR. CROWLEY

AMENDMENT NO. 6: Page 8, after line 8, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS.**

It is the sense of the Congress that the President should use authority provided under section 161 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6241) to release petroleum from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve when oil and gas prices in the United States have risen sharply because of international oil price fixing activities, particularly activities by the member nations of OPEC and their allies.

Page 8, line 9, redesignate section 7 as section 8.

H.R. 3822

OFFERED BY: MR. CROWLEY

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 8, after line 8, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 7. SENSE OF CONGRESS.**

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) international oil price fixing results in wide price fluctuations, which are not beneficial to the United States economy;

(2) higher oil and gas prices mean United States consumers pay more for their home heating bills and more for gasoline to drive their cars;

(3) these inflated prices affect all areas of the United States economy, but have a particularly adverse impact on our senior citizens; and

(4) the President should use all powers necessary to reduce United States domestic oil and gas prices when international anti-competitive practices by the member nations of OPEC adversely affect the price paid by American consumers.

Page 8, line 9, redesignate section 7 as section 8.

H.R. 3822

OFFERED BY: MR. DEFazio

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Insert the following after section 6 and redesignate the succeeding section accordingly:

**SEC. 7. SUSPENSION OF EXPORTS OF ALASKAN NORTH SLOPE CRUDE OIL.**

(a) SUSPENSION.—Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) subsection (s) of section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 185(s)) shall cease to be effective; and

(2) subsection (d) of section 7 of the Export Administration Act of 1999 (50 U.S.C. App 2406(d)) shall be effective, notwithstanding section 20 of that Act.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The President may exercise the authorities he has under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act to carry out subsection (a).

(c) LIFTING OF SUSPENSION.—If the President determines that the United States is not experiencing a shortage of foreign crude oil and an inflationary impact due to the demand for foreign crude oil, subsections (a) and (b) shall cease to apply 30 calendar days after the President submits that determination to the Congress.

H.R. 3822

OFFERED BY: MR. DINGELL

AMENDMENT NO. 9: Page 8, after line 8, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 7. ENERGY POLICY AND CONSERVATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION.**

(a) TITLE I.—Title I of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6211-6251) is amended—

(1) in section 166 (42 U.S.C. 6246)—

(A) by inserting "through 2003" after "2000"; and

(B) by striking "to remain available only through March 31, 2000"; and

(2) in section 181 (42 U.S.C. 6251), by striking "March 31, 2000" each place it appears and inserting "September 30, 2003".

(b) TITLE II.—Title II of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6261-6285) is amended—

(1) in section 256(h) (42 U.S.C. 6276(h)), by inserting "through 2003" after "1997"; and

(2) in section 281 (42 U.S.C. 6285), by striking "March 31, 2000" each place it appears and inserting "September 30, 2003".

Page 8, line 9, redesignate section 7 as section 8.

H.R. 3822

OFFERED BY: MR. HOBSON

AMENDMENT NO. 10: At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

**SEC. 8. REPEAL OF 1993 INCREASES IN MOTOR FUEL TAXES.**

(a) HIGHWAY GASOLINE.—Clause (i) of section 4081(a)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "18.3 cents" and inserting "14 cents".

(b) AVIATION GASOLINE.—Clause (ii) of section 4081(a)(2)(A) of such Code is amended by striking “19.3 cents” and inserting “15 cents”.

(c) DIESEL FUEL AND KEROSENE.—Clause (iii) of section 4081(a)(2)(A) of such Code is amended by striking “24.3 cents” and inserting “20 cents”.

(d) AVIATION FUEL.—Paragraph (1) of section 4091(b) of such Code is amended by striking “21.8 cents” and inserting “17.5 cents”.

(e) FUEL USED ON INLAND WATERWAYS.—

(1) Paragraph (1) of section 4042(b) of such Code is amended by adding “and” at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking “, and” at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting a period, and by striking subparagraph (C).

(2) Paragraph (2) of section 4042(b) of such Code is amended by striking subparagraph (C).

(f) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subparagraph (B) of section 40(e)(1) of such Code is amended by striking “during which the rates of tax under section 4081(a)(2)(A) are 4.3 cents per gallon” and inserting “during which the rate of tax under section 4081(a)(2)(A) does not apply”.

(2) Subparagraph (A) of section 4041(a)(1) of such Code is amended by striking “or a diesel-powered train” each place it appears and by striking “or train”.

(3) Subparagraph (C) of section 4041(a)(1) of such Code is amended by striking clause (ii) and by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii).

(4) Subclause (I) of section 4041(a)(1)(C)(ii) of such Code, as redesignated by paragraph (3), is amended by striking “7.3 cents” and inserting “3 cents” and by striking “4.3 cents per gallon” and inserting “zero”.

(5) Subsection (a) of section 4041 of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(6) Subparagraph (C) of section 4041(b)(1) of such Code is amended by striking all that follows “section 6421(e)(2)” and inserting a period.

(7) Subparagraph (B) of section 4041(a)(2) of such Code is amended by striking all that follows clause (i) and inserting the following new clauses:

“(ii) 10.4 cents per gallon in the case of liquefied petroleum gas, and

“(iii) 9.1 cents per gallon in the case of liquefied natural gas.”

(8) Paragraph (3) of section 4041(c) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(3) TERMINATION.—The rate of the taxes imposed by paragraph (1) shall be zero after September 30, 2007.”

(9) Subsection (d) of section 4041 of such Code is amended by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4) and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) DIESEL FUEL USED IN TRAINS.—There is hereby imposed a tax of 0.1 cent per gallon on any liquid other than gasoline (as defined in section 4083)—

“(A) sold by any person to an owner, lessee, or other operator of a diesel-powered train for use as a fuel in such train, or

“(B) used by any person as a fuel in a diesel-powered train unless there was a taxable sale of such fuel under subparagraph (A).

No tax shall be imposed by this paragraph on the sale or use of any liquid if tax was imposed on such liquid under section 4081.”

(10) Clauses (i) and (ii) of section 4041(m)(1)(A) of such Code are amended to read as follows:

“(i) 7 cents per gallon on and after the date of the enactment of this clause and before October 1, 2005, and

“(ii) zero after September 30, 2005, and”.

(11) Subsection (c) of section 4081 of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (6) and by redesignating paragraphs (7) and (8) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively.

(12) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 4081(d) of such Code are amended to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The rates of tax specified in clauses (i) and (iii) of subsection (a)(2)(A) shall be zero after September 30, 2005.

“(2) AVIATION GASOLINE.—The rate of tax specified in subsection (a)(2)(A)(ii) shall be zero after September 30, 2007.

(13) Subsection (f) of section 4082 of such Code is amended by striking “section 4041(a)(1)” and inserting “subsections (d)(3) and (a)(1) of section 4041, respectively”.

(14) Paragraph (3) of section 4083(a) of such Code is amended by striking “or a diesel-powered train”.

(15) Subparagraph (A) of section 4091(b)(3) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(A) The rate of tax specified in paragraph (1) shall be zero after September 30, 2007.”

(16) Paragraph (1) of section 4091(c) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “14 cents” and inserting “9.7 cents”,

(B) by striking “13.3 cents” and inserting “9 cents”,

(C) by striking “13.2 cents” and inserting “8.9 cents”,

(D) by striking “13.1 cents” and inserting “8.8 cents”, and

(E) by striking “13.4 cents” and inserting “9.1 cents”.

(17) Subsection (c) of section 4091 of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (4), and by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (4).

(18) Subsection (b) of section 4092 of such Code is amended by striking “attributable to” and all that follows and inserting “attributable to the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund financing rate imposed by such section. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term ‘commercial aviation’ means any use of an aircraft other than in noncommercial aviation (as defined in section 4041(c)(2)).”

(19) Subparagraph (B) of section 6421(f)(2) of such Code is amended by striking “and,” and all that follows and inserting a period.

(20) Paragraph (3) of section 6421(f) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(3) GASOLINE USED IN TRAINS.—In the case of gasoline used as a fuel in a train, this section shall not apply with respect to the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund financing rate under section 4081.”

(21) Subparagraph (A) of section 6427(b)(2) of such Code is amended by striking “7.4 cents” and inserting “3.1 cents”.

(22) Paragraph (3) of section 6427(l) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(3) REFUND OF CERTAIN TAXES ON FUEL USED IN DIESEL-POWERED TRAINS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘nontaxable use’ includes fuel used in a diesel-powered train. The preceding sentence shall not apply to the tax imposed by section 4041(d) and the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund financing rate under section 4081 except with respect to fuel sold for exclusive use by a State or any political subdivision thereof.”

(23) Paragraph (4) of section 6427(l) of such Code is amended by striking “attributable to” and all that follows through the period and inserting “attributable to the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund financing rate imposed by such section.”

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(h) FLOOR STOCK REFUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If—

(A) before the date of the enactment of this Act, tax has been imposed under section 4081 or 4091 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 on any liquid, and

(B) on such date such liquid is held by a dealer and has not been used and is intended for sale,

there shall be credited or refunded (without interest) to the person who paid such tax (hereafter in this subsection referred to as the “taxpayer”) an amount equal to the excess of the tax paid by the taxpayer over the amount of such tax which would be imposed on such liquid had the taxable event occurred on such date.

(2) TIME FOR FILING CLAIMS.—No credit or refund shall be allowed or made under this subsection unless—

(A) claim therefor is filed with the Secretary of the Treasury before the date which is 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, based on a request submitted to the taxpayer before the date which is 3 months after such date of enactment, by the dealer who held the liquid on such date of enactment, and

(B) the taxpayer has repaid or agreed to repay the amount so claimed to such dealer or has obtained the written consent of such dealer to the allowance of the credit or the making of the refund.

(3) EXCEPTION FOR FUEL HELD IN RETAIL STOCKS.—No credit or refund shall be allowed under this subsection with respect to any liquid in retail stocks held at the place where intended to be sold at retail.

(4) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms “dealer” and “held by a dealer” have the respective meanings given to such terms by section 6412 of such Code.

(5) CERTAIN RULES TO APPLY.—Rules similar to the rules of subsections (b) and (c) of section 6412 of such Code shall apply for purposes of this subsection.

(i) EXCLUSION OF EFFECTS OF THIS SECTION FROM THE PAYGO SCORECARD.—Upon the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall not make any estimates of changes in receipts under section 252(d) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

H.R. 3822

OFFERED BY: MR. LARSON

AMENDMENT No. 11: Page 8, after line 8, insert the following new section:

#### SEC. 7. OIL PRICE SAFEGUARDS.

(a) DRAWDOWN OF STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE.—Section 161(d) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6241(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) REDUCTION IN SUPPLY CAUSED BY ANTI-COMPETITIVE CONDUCT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes of this section, in addition to the circumstances set forth in section 3(8) and in paragraph (2) of this subsection, a severe energy supply interruption shall be deemed to exist if the President determines that—

“(i) there is a significant reduction in supply that—

“(I) is of significant scope and duration; and

“(II) has caused a significant increase in the price of petroleum products;

“(ii) the increase in price is likely to cause a significant adverse impact on the national economy; and

“(iii) a substantial cause of the reduction in supply is the anticompetitive conduct of 1 or more foreign countries or international entities.

“(B) DEPOSIT AND USE OF PROCEEDS.—Proceeds from the sale of petroleum drawn down pursuant to a Presidential determination under subparagraph (A) shall—

“(i) be deposited in the SPR Petroleum Account; and

“(ii) be used only for the purposes specified in section 167.”.

(b) REPORTING AND CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS.—If the price of a barrel of crude oil exceeds \$25 (in constant 1999 United States dollars) for a period greater than 14 days, the President, through the Secretary of Energy, shall, not later than 30 days after the end of the 14-day period, submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Commerce of the House of Representatives a report that—

(1) states the results of a comprehensive review of the causes and potential consequences of the price increase;

(2) provides an estimate of the likely duration of the price increase, based on analyses and forecasts of the Energy Information Administration;

(3) provides an analysis of the effects of the price increase on the cost of home heating oil; and

(4) states whether, and provides a specific rationale for why, the President does or does not support the drawdown and distribution of a specified amount of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

Page 8, line 9, redesignate section 7 as section 8.

H.R. 3822

OFFERED BY: MR. GARY MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT No. 12: Page 8, after line 8, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 7. OIL PRODUCTION REPORT.**

The Secretary of Energy, in conjunction with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall, not later than September 30, 2000, transmit to the Congress a report on all possible means of protecting the national security of the United States by increasing domestic oil production without harming the environment.

Page 8, line 9, redesignate section 7 as section 8.

H.R. 3822

OFFERED BY: MR. NETHERCUTT

AMENDMENT No. 13: Page 7, strike line 21 and all that follows through line 8 on page 8.

H.R. 3822

OFFERED BY: MR. NETHERCUTT

AMENDMENT No. 14: Page 8, line 3, after "assistance" insert "(other than assistance consisting of agricultural commodities, medicine, or medical devices)".

Page 8, after line 8, insert the following:

(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in subsection (c):

(1) AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.—The term "agricultural commodity" has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5602).

(2) MEDICAL DEVICE.—The term "medical device" has the meaning given the term "device" in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(3) MEDICINE.—The term "medicine" has the meaning given the term "drug" in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

H.R. 3822

OFFERED BY: MR. NETHERCUTT

AMENDMENT No. 15: Page 8, after line 8, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent section accordingly):

**SEC. 7. TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.**

Any reduction, suspension, or termination of assistance that is imposed pursuant to section 6(c) shall terminate not later than 2 years after the date on which the reduction, suspension, or termination, as the case may be, became effective.

H.R. 3822

OFFERED BY: MR. SALMON

AMENDMENT No. 16: Page 8, insert the following after line 8 and redesignate the succeeding section accordingly:

**SEC. 7. BLOCKING OF ASSETS.**

(a) PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY.—The President may exercise the authorities under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act without regard to section 202 of that Act to block property in which any country that is determined under section 5 to be engaged in oil price fixing to the detriment of the United States economy has any interest.

(b) SUBSEQUENT DETERMINATION OF OIL-PRICE FIXING.—Not later than 6 months after the report is transmitted under section 4, the President shall determine and report to the Congress, with respect to each country described in section 4(l), whether or not, as of the date the President makes the determination, that country is engaged in oil price fixing to the detriment of the United States economy. The President shall include in the report the basis for each such determination.

(c) MANDATORY BLOCKING OF ASSETS.—The President shall exercise the authorities under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act without regard to section 202 of that Act (50 U.S.C. 1701) to block all property in which any country that is determined under subsection (b) to be engaged in oil price fixing to the detriment of the United States economy has any interest.

(d) POSTING OF BLOCKED PROPERTY.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall publish online a list of all property blocked pursuant to this section.

(e) PENALTIES.—The penalties set forth in section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to violations of any license, order, or regulation issues under subsection (a) or (c).

H.R. 3822

OFFERED BY: MR. SALMON

AMENDMENT No. 17: Page 8, insert the following after line 8 and redesignate the succeeding section accordingly:

**SEC. 7. BLOCKING OF ASSETS.**

(a) PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY.—The President may exercise the authorities under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act without regard to section 202 of that Act to block property in which any country that is determined under section 5 to be engaged in oil price fixing to the detriment of the United States economy has any interest.

(b) SUBSEQUENT DETERMINATION OF OIL-PRICE FIXING.—Not later than 6 months after the report is transmitted under section 4, the President shall determine and report to the Congress, with respect to each country described in section 4(l), whether or not, as of the date the President makes the determination, that country is engaged in oil price fix-

ing to the detriment of the United States economy. The President shall include in the report the basis for each such determination.

(c) MANDATORY BLOCKING OF ASSETS.—The President shall exercise the authorities under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act without regard to section 202 of that Act (50 U.S.C. 1701) to block all property in which any country that is determined under subsection (b) to be engaged in oil price fixing to the detriment of the United States economy has any interest.

(d) PENALTIES.—The penalties set forth in section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to violations of any license, order, or regulation issues under subsection (a).

H.R. 3822

OFFERED BY: MR. SALMON

AMENDMENT No. 18: Page 8, insert the following after line 8 and redesignate the succeeding section accordingly:

**SEC. 7. BLOCKING OF ASSETS.**

(a) PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY.—The President may exercise the authorities under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act without regard to section 202 of that Act to block property in which any country that is determined under section 5 to be engaged in oil price fixing to the detriment of the United States economy has any interest.

(b) PENALTIES.—The penalties set forth in section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to violations of any license, order, or regulation issues under subsection (a).

H.R. 3822

OFFERED BY: MR. SHERWOOD

AMENDMENT No. 19: Page 8, after line 2, insert the following (and conform subsequent section numbers accordingly):

**SEC. 7. REPORT BY SECRETARY OF ENERGY ON REDUCING OIL PRICE FIXING AND UNITED STATES DEPENDENCE ON FOREIGN OIL.**

Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall submit a report to the Congress recommending both short-term and long-term solutions by which the United States can reduce oil price fixing and United States dependence on foreign oil. Such report shall include—

(1) an analysis of options for—

(A) sales or exchanges of crude oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve established under part B of title I of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6232 et seq.); and

(B) increasing efficiency in energy utilization;

(2) a plan for increasing natural gas supply to markets in the northeastern United States; and

(3) an evaluation of how the United States can increase domestic crude oil production to alleviate risks to national security due to oil price fixing and dependence on foreign oil.

H.R. 3822

OFFERED BY: MRS. THURMAN

AMENDMENT No. 20: Add at the end thereof the following new title:

**TITLE II—ENERGY EFFICIENT TECHNOLOGY TAX INCENTIVES**

**SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Energy Efficient Technology Tax Act".

**SEC. 202. CREDIT FOR CERTAIN ENERGY-EFFICIENT PROPERTY USED IN BUSINESS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart E of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 48 the following new section:

**"SEC. 48A. ENERGY CREDIT.**

"(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 46, the energy credit for any taxable year is the sum of—



“(1) the amount equal to the energy percentage of the basis of each energy property placed in service during such taxable year, and

“(2) the credit amount for each qualified hybrid vehicle placed in service during the taxable year.

“(b) ENERGY PERCENTAGE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The energy percentage shall be determined in accordance with the following table:

Column A—Description	Column B—Energy Percentage	Column C—Period	
		For the period:	
In the case of:	The energy percentage is:	Beginning on:	Ending on:
Solar energy property (other than elected solar hot water property and photovoltaic property) and geothermal energy property .....	10 percent	1/1/2000	no end date
Elected solar hot water property .....	15 percent	1/1/2000	12/31/2004
Photovoltaic property .....	15 percent	1/1/2000	12/31/2006
20 percent energy-efficient building property .....	20 percent	1/1/2000	12/31/2003
10 percent energy-efficient building property .....	10 percent	1/1/2000	12/31/2001
Combined heat and power system property .....	8 percent	1/1/2000	12/31/2002.

“(2) PERIODS FOR WHICH PERCENTAGE NOT SPECIFIED.—In the case of any energy property, the energy percentage shall be zero for any period for which an energy percentage is not specified for such property under paragraph (1).

“(3) COORDINATION WITH REHABILITATION.—The energy percentage shall not apply to that portion of the basis of any property which is attributable to qualified rehabilitation expenditures.

“(4) TRANSITIONAL RULES.—Rules similar to the rules of section 48(m) (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990) shall apply for purposes of this subsection.

“(c) MAXIMUM CREDIT FOR CERTAIN PROPERTY.—In the case of property described in the following table, the amount of the current year business credit under subsection (a) for the taxable year for each item of such property with respect to a building shall not exceed the amount specified for such property in such table:

Description of property:	Maximum allowable credit amount is:
Elected solar hot water property .....	\$1,000.
Photovoltaic property with respect to which the energy percentage is greater than 10 percent .....	\$2,000.
20 percent energy-efficient building property:	
fuel cell described in subsection (e)(3)(A) .....	\$500 per each kw/hr of capacity.
natural gas heat pump described in subsection (e)(3)(D) .....	\$1,000.
20 percent energy-efficient building property (other than a fuel cell and a natural gas heat pump) .....	\$500.
10 percent energy-efficient building property .....	\$250.

“(d) ENERGY PROPERTY DEFINED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subpart, the term ‘energy property’ means any property—

“(A) which is—

“(i) solar energy property,

“(ii) geothermal energy property,

“(iii) 20 percent energy-efficient building property,

“(iv) 10 percent energy-efficient building property, or

“(v) combined heat and power system property,

“(B)(i) the construction, reconstruction, or erection of which is completed by the taxpayer, or

“(ii) which is acquired by the taxpayer if the original use of such property commences with the taxpayer,

“(C) with respect to which depreciation (or amortization in lieu of depreciation) is allowable, and

“(D) which meets the performance and quality standards (if any), and the certification requirements (if any), which—

“(i) have been prescribed by the Secretary by regulations (after consultation with the Secretary of Energy or the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, as appropriate), and

“(ii) are in effect at the time of the acquisition of the property.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—Such term shall not include any property which is public utility property (as defined in section 46(f)(5) as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990). The preceding sentence shall not apply to combined heat and power system property.

“(e) DEFINITIONS RELATING TO TYPES OF ENERGY PROPERTY.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) SOLAR ENERGY PROPERTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘solar energy property’ means equipment which uses solar energy—

“(i) to generate electricity,

“(ii) to heat or cool (or provide hot water for use in) a structure, or

“(iii) to provide solar process heat.

“(B) ELECTED SOLAR WATER HEATING PROPERTY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘elected solar water heating property’ means property which is solar energy property by reason of subparagraph (A)(ii) and for which an election under this subparagraph is in effect.

“(ii) ELECTION.—For purposes of clause (i) and the energy percentage specified in the table in subsection (b)(1), a taxpayer may elect to treat property described in clause (i) as elected solar water heating property.

“(C) PHOTOVOLTAIC PROPERTY.—The term ‘photovoltaic property’ means solar energy property which uses a solar photovoltaic process to generate electricity.

“(D) SWIMMING POOLS, ETC., USED AS STORAGE MEDIUM.—The term ‘solar energy property’ shall not include a swimming pool, hot tub, or any other energy storage medium which has a function other than the function of such storage.

“(E) SOLAR PANELS.—No solar panel or other property installed as a roof (or portion thereof) shall fail to be treated as solar energy property solely because it constitutes a structural component of the structure on which it is installed.

“(2) GEOTHERMAL ENERGY PROPERTY.—The term ‘geothermal energy property’ means equipment used to produce, distribute, or use energy derived from a geothermal deposit (within the meaning of section 613(e)(2)), but only, in the case of electricity generated by geothermal power, up to (but not including) the electrical transmission stage.

“(3) 20 PERCENT ENERGY-EFFICIENT BUILDING PROPERTY.—The term ‘20 percent energy-efficient building property’ means—

“(A) a fuel cell that—

“(i) generates electricity and heat using an electrochemical process,

“(ii) has an electricity-only generation efficiency greater than 35 percent, and

“(iii) has a minimum generating capacity of 5 kilowatts,

“(B) an electric heat pump hot water heater that yields an energy factor of 1.7 or greater,

“(C) an electric heat pump that has a heating system performance factor (HSPF) of 9 or greater and a cooling seasonal energy efficiency ratio (SEER) of 15 or greater,

“(D) a natural gas heat pump that has a coefficient of performance of not less than 1.25 for heating and not less than 0.70 for cooling,

“(E) a central air conditioner that has a cooling seasonal energy efficiency ratio (SEER) of 15 or greater, and

“(F) an advanced natural gas water heater that has an energy factor of at least 0.80.

“(4) 10 PERCENT ENERGY-EFFICIENT BUILDING PROPERTY.—The term ‘10 percent energy-efficient building property’ means—

“(A) an electric heat pump that has a heating system performance factor (HSPF) of 7.5 or greater and a cooling seasonal energy efficiency ratio (SEER) of 13.5 or greater,

“(B) a central air conditioner that has a cooling seasonal energy efficiency ratio (SEER) of 13.5 or greater, and

“(C) an advanced natural gas water heater that has an energy factor of at least 0.65.

“(5) COMBINED HEAT AND POWER SYSTEM PROPERTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘combined heat and power system property’ means property comprising a system—

“(i) which uses the same energy source for the simultaneous or sequential generation of electrical power, mechanical shaft power, or both, in combination with the generation of

steam or other forms of useful thermal energy (including heating and cooling applications),

“(ii) which has an electrical capacity of more than 50 kilowatts or a mechanical energy capacity of more than 67 horsepower or an equivalent combination of electrical and mechanical energy capacities,

“(iii) which produces—

“(I) at least 20 percent of its total useful energy in the form of thermal energy, and

“(II) at least 20 percent of its total useful energy in the form of electrical or mechanical power (or a combination thereof), and

“(iv) the energy efficiency percentage of which exceeds 60 percent (70 percent in the case of a system with an electrical capacity in excess of 50 megawatts or a mechanical energy capacity in excess of 67,000 horse-

power, or an equivalent combination of electrical and mechanical energy capacities).

“(B) SPECIAL RULES.—

“(i) ENERGY EFFICIENCY PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(iv), the energy efficiency percentage of a system is the fraction—

“(I) the numerator of which is the total useful electrical, thermal, and mechanical power produced by the system at normal operating rates, and

“(II) the denominator of which is the lower heating value of the primary fuel source for the system.

“(ii) DETERMINATIONS MADE ON BTU BASIS.—The energy efficiency percentage and the percentages under subparagraph (A)(iii) shall be determined on a Btu basis.

“(iii) INPUT AND OUTPUT PROPERTY NOT INCLUDED.—The term ‘combined heat and

power system property’ does not include property used to transport the energy source to the facility or to distribute energy produced by the facility.

“(iv) ACCOUNTING RULE FOR PUBLIC UTILITY PROPERTY.—In the case that combined heat and power system property is public utility property (as defined in section 46(f)(5) as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990), the taxpayer may only claim the credit under subsection (a)(I) if, with respect to such property, the taxpayer uses a normalization method of accounting.

“(v) DEPRECIATION.—No credit shall be allowed for any combined heat and power system property unless the taxpayer elects to treat such property for purposes of section 168 as having a class life of not less than 22 years.

“(f) QUALIFIED HYBRID VEHICLES.—For purposes of subsection (a)(2)—

“(1) CREDIT AMOUNT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The credit amount for each qualified hybrid vehicle with a rechargeable energy storage system that provides the applicable percentage of the maximum available power shall be the amount specified in the following table:

“Applicable percentage		Credit amount is:
Greater than or equal to—	Less than—	
5 percent .....	10 percent .....	\$ 500
10 percent .....	20 percent .....	\$1,000
20 percent .....	30 percent .....	\$1,500
30 percent .....		\$2,000

“(B) INCREASE IN CREDIT AMOUNT FOR REGENERATIVE BRAKING SYSTEM.—In the case of a qualified hybrid vehicle that actively employs a regenerative braking system which supplies to the rechargeable energy storage system the applicable percentage of the energy available from braking in a typical 60 miles per hour to 0 miles per hour braking event, the credit amount determined under subparagraph (A) shall be increased by the amount specified in the following table:

“Applicable percentage		Credit amount increase is:
Greater than or equal to—	Less than—	
20 percent .....	40 percent .....	\$ 250
40 percent .....	60 percent .....	\$ 500
60 percent .....		\$1,000

“(2) QUALIFIED HYBRID VEHICLE.—The term ‘qualified hybrid vehicle’ means an automobile that meets all applicable regulatory requirements and that can draw propulsion energy from both of the following on-board sources of stored energy:

“(A) A consumable fuel.

“(B) A rechargeable energy storage system.

“(3) MAXIMUM AVAILABLE POWER.—The term ‘maximum available power’ means the maximum value of the sum of the heat engine and electric drive system power or other non-heat energy conversion devices available for a driver’s command for maximum acceleration at vehicle speeds under 75 miles per hour.

“(4) AUTOMOBILE.—The term ‘automobile’ has the meaning given such term by section 4064(b)(1) (without regard to subparagraphs (B) and (C) thereof). A vehicle shall not fail to be treated as an automobile solely by reason of weight if such vehicle is rated at 8,500 pounds gross vehicle weight rating or less.

“(5) DOUBLE BENEFIT; PROPERTY USED OUTSIDE UNITED STATES, ETC., NOT QUALIFIED.—No credit shall be allowed under subsection (a)(2) with respect to—

“(A) any property for which a credit is allowed under section 25B or 30,

“(B) any property referred to in section 50(b), and

“(C) the portion of the cost of any property taken into account under section 179 or 179A.

“(6) REGULATIONS.—

“(A) TREASURY.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

“(B) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.—

“(A) TREASURY.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to specify the testing and calculation procedures that would be used to determine whether a vehicle meets the qualifications for a credit under this subsection.

“(7) TERMINATION.—Paragraph (2) shall not apply with respect to any vehicle placed in service during a calendar year ending before January 1, 2003, or after December 31, 2006.

“(g) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) SPECIAL RULE FOR PROPERTY FINANCED BY SUBSIDIZED ENERGY FINANCING OR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BONDS.—

“(A) REDUCTION OF BASIS.—For purposes of applying the energy percentage to any property, if such property is financed in whole or in part by—

“(i) subsidized energy financing, or

“(ii) the proceeds of a private activity bond (within the meaning of section 141) the interest on which is exempt from tax under section 103,

the amount taken into account as the basis of such property shall not exceed the amount which (but for this subparagraph) would be so taken into account multiplied by the fraction determined under subparagraph (B).

“(B) DETERMINATION OF FRACTION.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the fraction determined under this subparagraph is 1 reduced by a fraction—

“(i) the numerator of which is that portion of the basis of the property which is allocable to such financing or proceeds, and

“(ii) the denominator of which is the basis of the property.

“(C) SUBSIDIZED ENERGY FINANCING.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘subsidized energy financing’ means financing provided under a Federal, State, or local program a principal purpose of which is to provide subsidized financing for projects designed to conserve or produce energy.

“(2) BUSINESS USE.—The rule similar to the rule of section 25(B)(d)(5)(B) shall apply for purposes of determining the business use of a vehicle.

“(3) CERTAIN PROGRESS EXPENDITURE RULES MADE APPLICABLE.—Rules similar to the rules of subsections (c)(4) and (d) of section 46 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990) shall apply for purposes of this section.

“(4) DOUBLE BENEFIT.—Property which would, but for this paragraph, be eligible for credit under more than one provision of this section shall be eligible only under one such provision, the provision specified by the taxpayer.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 48 of such Code is amended to read as follows:

#### “SEC. 48. REFORESTATION CREDIT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 46, the reforestation credit for any taxable year is 10 percent of the portion of the amortizable basis of any qualified timber property which was acquired during such taxable year

and which is taken into account under section 194 (after the application of section 194(b)(1)).

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subpart, the terms ‘amortizable basis’ and ‘qualified timber property’ have the respective meanings given to such terms by section 194.”.

(2) Subsection (d) of section 39 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(9) NO CARRYBACK OF ENERGY CREDIT BEFORE EFFECTIVE DATE.—No portion of the unused business credit for any taxable year which is attributable to the energy credit determined under section 48A may be carried back to a taxable year ending before the date of the enactment of section 48A.”.

(3) Paragraph (3) of section 50(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence:

“In the case of the energy credit, the preceding sentence shall apply only to so much of such credit as relates to solar energy property and geothermal property (as such terms are defined in section 48A(e)).”.

(4) Subclause (III) of section 29(b)(3)(A)(i) of such Code is amended by striking “section 48(a)(4)(C)” and inserting “section 48A(g)(1)(C)”.

(5) Subparagraph (E) of section 50(a)(2) of such Code is amended by striking “section 48(a)(5)” and inserting “section 48A(g)(3)”.

(6) Subparagraph (B) of section 168(e)(3) of such Code is amended—

(A) in clause (vi)(I)—

(i) by striking “section 48(a)(3)” and inserting “paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 48A(e)”, and

(ii) by striking “clause (i)” and inserting “paragraph (1)(A)”, and

(B) in the last sentence by striking “section 48(a)(3)” and inserting “section 48A(d)(2)”.

(7) Subparagraph (E) of section 168(e)(3) of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of clause (ii), by striking the period at the end of clause (iii) and inserting “, and”, and by inserting after clause (iii) the following new clause:

“(iv) any combined heat and power system property (as defined in section 48A(e)(5)) for which a credit is allowed under section 48A and which, but for this clause, would have a recovery period of less than 15 years.”.

(8) The table contained in subparagraph (B) of section 168(g)(3) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E)(iv) ..... 22”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart E of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking the item relating to section 48 and inserting the following new items:

“Sec. 48. Reforestation credit.

“Sec. 48A. Energy credit.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to periods after December 31, 1999, under rules similar to the rules of section 48(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1990).

#### SEC. 203. EXTENSION OF CREDIT FOR QUALIFIED ELECTRIC VEHICLES.

(a) EXTENSION OF CREDIT FOR QUALIFIED ELECTRIC VEHICLES.—Subsection (f) of section 30 of such Code (relating to termination) is amended by striking “December 31, 2004” and inserting “December 31, 2006”.

(b) REPEAL OF PHASEOUT.—Subsection (b) of section 30 of such Code (relating to limitations) is amended by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(c) NO DOUBLE BENEFIT.—

(1) Subsection (d) of section 30 of such Code (relating to special rules) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) No credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) with respect to any vehicle if the taxpayer claims a credit for such vehicle under section 25B(a)(1)(B) or 48A(f).”.

(2) Paragraph (3) of section 30(d) of such Code (relating to property used outside United States, etc., not qualified) is amended by striking “section 50(b)” and inserting “section 25B, 48A, or 50(b)”.

(3) Paragraph (5) of section 179A(e) of such Code (relating to property used outside United States, etc., not qualified) is amended by striking “section 50(b)” and inserting “section 25B, 48A, or 50(b)”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 204. MODIFICATIONS TO CREDIT FOR ELECTRICITY PRODUCED FROM CERTAIN RENEWABLE RESOURCES.

(a) EXTENSION.—Paragraph (3) of section 45(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to qualified facility) is amended by striking “July 1, 1999” and inserting “July 1, 2004”.

(b) QUALIFIED FACILITIES INCLUDE ALL BIOMASS FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 45(c) of such Code (relating to definition of qualified energy resources) is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B), and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) biomass (other than closed-loop biomass).”.

(2) BIOMASS DEFINED.—Paragraph (2) of section 45(c) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(2) BIOMASS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘biomass’ means—

“(i) closed-loop biomass, and

“(ii) any solid, nonhazardous, cellulosic waste material, which is segregated from other waste materials, and which is derived from—

“(I) any of the following forest-related resources: mill residues, precommercial thinnings, slash, and brush, but not including old-growth timber,

“(II) waste pallets, crates, and dunnage, and landscape or right-of-way tree trimmings, but not including unsegregated municipal solid waste (garbage) and post-consumer wastepaper, or

“(III) agriculture sources, including orchard tree crops, vineyard, grain, legumes, sugar, and other crop by-products or residues.

“(B) CLOSED-LOOP BIOMASS.—The term ‘closed-loop biomass’ means any organic material from a plant which is planted exclusively for purposes of being used at a qualified facility to produce electricity.”.

(c) ELECTRICITY PRODUCED FROM BIOMASS CO-FIRED IN COAL PLANTS.—

(1) CREDIT AMOUNT.—Paragraph (1) of section 45(a) of such Code (relating to general rule) is amended by inserting “(1.0 cents in the case of electricity produced from biomass co-fired in a facility which produces electricity from coal) after “1.5 cents”.

(2) QUALIFIED FACILITY.—Paragraph (3) of section 45(c) of such Code (relating to definitions) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, and any facility using biomass other than closed loop biomass to produce electricity which is owned by the taxpayer and which is originally placed in service after June 30, 1999.”.

(3) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 45(b) of such Code (relating to credit and phaseout adjustment based on inflation) is amended by striking “1.5 cent amount” and inserting “1.5 and 1.0 cent amounts”.

(B) BASE YEAR FOR INFLATION ADJUSTMENT FACTOR.—Subparagraph (B) of section 45(d)(2) of such Code (relating to inflation adjustment factor) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “In the case of the 1.0 cents amount in subsection (a), the first sentence of this subparagraph shall be applied by substituting ‘1999’ for ‘1992’.”.

(d) CREDIT NOT TO APPLY TO ELECTRICITY SOLD TO UTILITIES UNDER CERTAIN CONTRACTS.—Subsection (b) of section 45 of such Code (relating to limitations and adjustments) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) CREDIT NOT TO APPLY TO ELECTRICITY SOLD TO UTILITIES UNDER CERTAIN CONTRACTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The credit determined under subsection (a) shall not apply to electricity—

“(i) produced at a qualified facility placed in service by the taxpayer after June 30, 1999, and

“(ii) sold to a utility pursuant to a contract originally entered into before January 1, 1987 (whether or not amended or restated after that date).

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply if—

“(i) the prices for energy and capacity from such facility are established pursuant to an amendment to the contract referred to in subparagraph (A)(ii),

“(ii) such amendment provides that the prices set forth in the contract which exceed avoided cost prices determined at the time of delivery shall apply only to annual quantities of electricity (prorated for partial years) which do not exceed the greater of—

“(I) the average annual quantity of electricity sold to the utility under the contract during calendar years 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998, or

“(II) the estimate of the annual electricity production set forth in the contract, or, if there is no such estimate, the greatest annual quantity of electricity sold to the utility under the contract in any of the calendar years 1996, 1997, or 1998, and

“(iii) such amendment provides that energy and capacity in excess of the limitation in clause (ii) may be—

“(I) sold to the utility only at prices that do not exceed avoided cost prices determined at the time of delivery, or

“(II) sold to a third party subject to a mutually agreed upon advance notice to the utility.

For purposes of this subparagraph, avoided cost prices shall be determined as provided for in section 292.304(d)(1) of title 18, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after June 30, 1999.

(2) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—The amendments made by subsection (c)(3) shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 1999.

#### SEC. 205. CREDIT FOR CERTAIN NONBUSINESS ENERGY PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to nonrefundable personal credits) is amended by inserting after section 25A the following new section:

“SEC. 25B. NONBUSINESS ENERGY PROPERTY.

“(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to the sum of—

“(A) the applicable percentage of residential energy property expenditures made by the taxpayer during such year,

“(2) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The applicable percentage shall be determined in accordance with the following table:

Column A—Description	Column B—Applicable Percentage	Column C—Period	
		For the period:	
In the case of:	The applicable percentage is:	Beginning on:	Ending on:
20 percent energy-efficient building property .....	20 percent	1/1/2000	12/31/2003
10 percent energy-efficient building property .....	10 percent	1/1/2000	12/31/2001
Solar water heating property .....	15 percent	1/1/2000	12/31/2006
Photovoltaic property .....	15 percent	1/1/2000	12/31/2006.

“(B) PERIODS FOR WHICH PERCENTAGE NOT SPECIFIED.—In the case of any residential energy property, the applicable percentage shall be zero for any period for which an applicable percentage is not specified for such property under subparagraph (A).

“(b) MAXIMUM CREDIT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of property described in the following table, the amount of the credit allowed under subsection (a)(1)(A) for the taxable year for each item of such property with respect to a dwelling unit shall not exceed the amount specified for such property in such table:

“Description of property item:	Maximum allowable credit amount is:
20 percent energy-efficient building property (other than a fuel cell or natural gas heat pump) .....	\$500.
20 percent energy-efficient building property:	
fuel cell described in section 48A (e)(3)(A) .....	\$ 500 per each kw/hr of capacity.
natural gas heat pump described in section 48A (e)(3)(D) .....	\$1,000.
10 percent energy-efficient building property .....	\$ 250.
Solar water heating property .....	\$1,000.
Photovoltaic property .....	\$2,000.

“(2) COORDINATION OF LIMITATIONS.—If a credit is allowed to the taxpayer for any taxable year by reason of an acquisition of a new, highly energy-efficient principal residence, no other credit shall be allowed under subsection (a)(1)(A) with respect to such residence during the 1-taxable year period beginning with such taxable year.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) RESIDENTIAL ENERGY PROPERTY EXPENDITURES.—The term ‘residential energy property expenditures’ means expenditures made by the taxpayer for qualified energy property installed on or in connection with a dwelling unit which—

“(A) is located in the United States, and

“(B) is used by the taxpayer as a residence.

Such term includes expenditures for labor costs properly allocable to the onsite preparation, assembly, or original installation of the property.

“(2) QUALIFIED ENERGY PROPERTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified energy property’ means—

“(i) energy-efficient building property,

“(ii) solar water heating property, and

“(iii) photovoltaic property.

“(B) SWIMMING POOL, ETC., USED AS STORAGE MEDIUM; SOLAR PANELS.—For purposes of this paragraph, the provisions of subparagraphs (D) and (E) section 48A(e)(1) shall apply.

“(3) ENERGY-EFFICIENT BUILDING PROPERTY.—The term ‘energy-efficient building property’ has the meaning given to such term by paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 48A(e).

“(4) SOLAR WATER HEATING PROPERTY.—The term ‘solar water heating property’ means property which, when installed in connection with a structure, uses solar energy for the purpose of providing hot water for use within such structure.

“(5) PHOTOVOLTAIC PROPERTY.—The term ‘photovoltaic property’ has the meaning given to such term by section 48A(e)(1)(C).

“(B) the credit amount (determined under section 48A(f)) for each vehicle purchased during the taxable year which is a qualified hybrid vehicle (as defined in section 48A(f)(2)), and

“(C) the credit amount specified in the following table for a new, highly energy-efficient principal residence:

	Credit Amount:
“New, Highly Energy-Efficient Principal Residence:	
30 percent property .....	\$1,000.
40 percent property .....	\$1,500.
50 percent property .....	\$2,000.

“(6) NEW, HIGHLY ENERGY-EFFICIENT PRINCIPAL RESIDENCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Property is a new, highly energy-efficient principal residence if—

“(i) such property is located in the United States,

“(ii) the original use of such property commences with the taxpayer and is, at the time of such use, the principal residence of the taxpayer, and

“(iii) such property is certified before such use commences as being 50 percent property, 40 percent property, or 30 percent property.

“(B) 50, 40, OR 30 PERCENT PROPERTY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), property is 50 percent property, 40 percent property, or 30 percent property if the projected energy usage of such property is reduced by 50 percent, 40 percent, or 30 percent, respectively, compared to the energy usage of a reference house that complies with minimum standard practice, such as the 1998 International Energy Conservation Code of the International Code Council, as determined according to the requirements specified in clause (ii).

“(ii) PROCEDURES.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of clause (i), energy usage shall be demonstrated either by a component-based approach or a performance-based approach.

“(II) COMPONENT APPROACH.—Compliance by the component approach is achieved when all of the components of the house comply with the requirements of prescriptive packages established by the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, such that they are equivalent to the results of using the performance-based approach of subclause (III) to achieve the required reduction in energy usage.

“(III) PERFORMANCE-BASED APPROACH.—Performance-based compliance shall be demonstrated in terms of the required percentage reductions in projected energy use. Computer software used in support of perform-

ance-based compliance must meet all of the procedures and methods for calculating energy savings reductions that are promulgated by the Secretary of Energy. Such regulations on the specifications for software shall be based in the 1998 California Residential Alternative Calculation Method Approval Manual, except that the calculation procedures shall be developed such that the same energy efficiency measures qualify a home for tax credits regardless of whether the home uses a gas or oil furnace or boiler, or an electric heat pump.

“(IV) APPROVAL OF SOFTWARE SUBMISSIONS.—The Secretary of Energy shall approve software submissions that comply with the calculation requirements of subclause (III).

“(C) DETERMINATIONS OF COMPLIANCE.—A determination of compliance made for the purposes of this paragraph shall be filed with the Secretary of Energy within 1 year of the date of such determination and shall include the TIN of the certifier, the address of the building in compliance, and the identity of the person for whom such determination was performed. Determinations of compliance filed with the Secretary of Energy shall be available for inspection by the Secretary.

“(D) COMPLIANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury shall establish requirements for certification and compliance procedures after examining the requirements for energy consultants and home energy ratings providers specified by the Mortgage Industry National Accreditation Procedures for Home Energy Rating Systems.

“(ii) INDIVIDUALS QUALIFIED TO DETERMINE COMPLIANCE.—Individuals qualified to determine compliance shall be only those individuals who are recognized by an organization certified by the Secretary of Energy for such purposes.

“(D) PRINCIPAL RESIDENCE.—The term ‘principal residence’ has the same meaning as when used in section 121, except that the period for which a building is treated as the principal residence of the taxpayer shall also include the 60-day period ending on the 1st day on which it would (but for this subparagraph) first be treated as his principal residence.

“(d) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) DOLLAR AMOUNTS IN CASE OF JOINT OCCUPANCY.—In the case of any dwelling unit which is jointly occupied and used during any calendar year as a residence by 2 or more individuals the following shall apply:

“(A) The amount of the credit allowable under subsection (a) by reason of expenditures made during such calendar year by any of such individuals with respect to such dwelling unit shall be determined by treating all of such individuals as 1 taxpayer whose taxable year is such calendar year.

“(B) There shall be allowable with respect to such expenditures to each of such individuals, a credit under subsection (a) for the taxable year in which such calendar year ends in an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount determined under subparagraph (A) as the amount of such expenditures made by such individual during such calendar year bears to the aggregate of such expenditures made by all of such individuals during such calendar year.

“(2) TENANT-STOCKHOLDER IN COOPERATIVE HOUSING CORPORATION.—In the case of an individual who is a tenant-stockholder (as defined in section 216) in a cooperative housing corporation (as defined in such section), such individual shall be treated as having made his tenant-stockholder's proportionate share (as defined in section 216(b)(3)) of any expenditures of such corporation.

“(3) CONDOMINIUMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual who is a member of a condominium management association with respect to a condominium which he owns, such individual shall be treated as having made his proportionate share of any expenditures of such association.

“(B) CONDOMINIUM MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘condominium management association’ means an organization which meets the requirements of paragraph (1) of section 528(c) (other than subparagraph (E) thereof) with respect to a condominium project substantially all of the units of which are used as residences.

“(4) JOINT OWNERSHIP OF ENERGY ITEMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Any expenditure otherwise qualifying as a residential energy property expenditure shall not be treated as failing to so qualify merely because such expenditure was made with respect to 2 or more dwelling units.

“(B) LIMITS APPLIED SEPARATELY.—In the case of any expenditure described in subparagraph (A), the amount of the credit allowable under subsection (a) shall (subject to paragraph (1)) be computed separately with respect to the amount of the expenditure made for each dwelling unit.

“(5) ALLOCATION IN CERTAIN CASES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), if less than 80 percent of the use of an item is for nonbusiness purposes, only that portion of the expenditures for such item which is properly allocable to use for nonbusiness purposes shall be taken into account. For purposes of this paragraph, use for a swimming pool shall be treated as use which is not for nonbusiness purposes.

“(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR VEHICLES.—For purposes of this section and section 48A, a vehicle shall be treated as used entirely for business or nonbusiness purposes if the majority

of the use of such vehicle is for business or nonbusiness purposes, as the case may be.

“(6) DOUBLE BENEFIT; PROPERTY USED OUTSIDE UNITED STATES, ETC., NOT QUALIFIED.—No credit shall be allowed under subsection (a)(1)(B) with respect to—

“(A) any property for which a credit is allowed under section 30 or 48A,

“(B) any property referred to in section 50(b), and

“(C) the portion of the cost of any property taken into account under section 179 or 179A.

“(7) WHEN EXPENDITURE MADE; AMOUNT OF EXPENDITURE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an expenditure with respect to an item shall be treated as made when the original installation of the item is completed.

“(B) EXPENDITURES PART OF BUILDING CONSTRUCTION.—In the case of an expenditure in connection with the construction of a structure, such expenditure shall be treated as made when the original use of the constructed structure by the taxpayer begins.

“(C) AMOUNT.—The amount of any expenditure shall be the cost thereof.

“(8) PROPERTY FINANCED BY SUBSIDIZED ENERGY FINANCING.—

“(A) REDUCTION OF EXPENDITURES.—For purposes of determining the amount of residential energy property expenditures made by any individual with respect to any dwelling unit, there shall not be taken in to account expenditures which are made from subsidized energy financing (as defined in section 48A(g)(1)).

“(B) DOLLAR LIMITS REDUCED.—The dollar amounts in the table contained in subsection (b)(1) with respect to each property purchased for such dwelling unit for any taxable year of such taxpayer shall be reduced proportionately by an amount equal to the sum of—

“(i) the amount of the expenditures made by the taxpayer during such taxable year with respect to such dwelling unit and not taken into account by reason of subparagraph (A), and

“(ii) the amount of any Federal, State, or local grant received by the taxpayer during such taxable year which is used to make residential energy property expenditures with respect to the dwelling unit and is not included in the gross income of such taxpayer.

“(e) BASIS ADJUSTMENTS.—For purposes of this subtitle, if a credit is allowed under this section for any expenditure with respect to any property, the increase in the basis of such property which would (but for this subsection) result from such expenditure shall be reduced by the amount of the credit so allowed.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (a) of section 1016 of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (26), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (27) and inserting “; and”, and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(28) to the extent provided in section 25B(e), in the case of amounts with respect to which a credit has been allowed under section 25B.”.

(2) The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 25A the following new item:

“Sec. 25B. Nonbusiness energy property.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to expenditures after December 31, 1999.

Page 2, after line 5, insert “TITLE I—OIL PRICE REDUCTION”.

Page 2, line 6, strike “2” and insert “101”.

Page 5, line 4, strike “3” and insert “102”.

Page 5, line 16, strike “4” and insert “103”.

Page 6, line 10, strike “section 5” and insert “section 104”.

Page 6, line 12, strike “5” and insert “104”.

Page 6, line 15, strike “section 4” and insert “section 103”.

Page 6, line 17, strike “section 4(1)” and insert “section 103(1)”.

Page 6, line 21, strike “6” and insert “105”.

Page 6, line 24, strike “section 4” and insert “section 103”.

Page 7, line 3, strike “section 5” and insert “section 104”.

Page 8, line 2, strike “section 4” and insert “section 103”.

Page 8, line 7, strike “section 5” and insert “section 104”.

Page 8, line 9, strike “7” and insert “106”.

Page 8, line 10, strike “Act” and insert “title”.

H.R. 3822

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT No. 21: Page 8, after line 2, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 7. CIVIL PENALTY FOR UNREASONABLE PRICE INCREASE FOR CRUDE OIL, RESIDUAL FUEL OIL, OR REFINED PETROLEUM PRODUCTS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall issue regulations that—

(1) apply to all crude oil, residual fuel oil, or refined petroleum products that are sold in the United States;

(2) prohibit any unreasonable price increase for such products by an energy-producing company (as defined in section 205(h)(6) of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7135(h)(6))); and

(3) impose a civil penalty of not more than \$100,000,000 for each unreasonable price increase.

(b) UNREASONABLE PRICE INCREASE DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term “unreasonable price increase” means any price increase that exceeds any concurrent increase in the production or operation costs of the energy-producing company that are directly related to the products being sold.

(c) DETERMINATION OF UNREASONABLE PRICE INCREASE.—The Administrator of the Energy Information Administration shall determine at least annually whether any energy-producing company has implemented an unreasonable price increase in violation of regulations issued under subsection (a).

Page 8, line 3, redesignate section 7 as section 8.

H.R. 3822

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT No. 22: Page 8, after line 8, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 7. CIVIL PENALTY FOR UNREASONABLE PRICE INCREASE FOR CRUDE OIL, RESIDUAL FUEL OIL, OR REFINED PETROLEUM PRODUCTS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall issue regulations that—

(1) apply to all crude oil, residual fuel oil, or refined petroleum products that are sold in the United States;

(2) prohibit any unreasonable price increase for such products by an energy-producing company (as defined in section 205(h)(6) of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7135(h)(6))); and

(3) impose a civil penalty of not more than \$100,000,000 for each unreasonable price increase.

(b) UNREASONABLE PRICE INCREASE DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term “unreasonable price increase” means

any price increase that exceeds any concurrent increase in the production or operation costs of the energy-producing company that are directly related to the products being sold.

(c) DETERMINATION OF UNREASONABLE PRICE INCREASE.—The Administrator of the Energy Information Administration shall determine at least annually whether any energy-producing company has implemented an unreasonable price increase in violation of regulations issued under subsection (a).

Page 8, line 9, redesignate section 7 as section 8.

H.R. 3822

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT No. 23: Page 8, after line 8, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 7. CIVIL PENALTY FOR UNREASONABLE PRICE INCREASE FOR CRUDE OIL, RESIDUAL FUEL OIL, OR REFINED PETROLEUM PRODUCTS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall issue regulations that—

(1) apply to all crude oil, residual fuel oil, or refined petroleum products that are sold in the United States;

(2) prohibit any unreasonable price increase for such products by an energy-producing company (as defined in section 205(h)(6) of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7135(h)(6))); and

(3) impose a civil penalty of not more than \$100,000,000 for each unreasonable price increase.

(b) UNREASONABLE PRICE INCREASE DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term “unreasonable price increase” means any price increase that exceeds any concur-

rent increase in the production or operation costs of the energy-producing company that are directly related to the products being sold.

(c) DETERMINATION OF UNREASONABLE PRICE INCREASE.—The Administrator of the Energy Information Administration shall determine at least annually whether any energy-producing company has implemented an unreasonable price increase in violation of regulations issued under subsection (a).

Page 8, line 9, redesignate section 7 as section 8.

S. 1287

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT No. 1: At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. . No foreign nuclear waste shall be allowed to enter the United States or to be deposited or stored in, on, or under the soil or waters of the United States.